DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 032 944 24 PS 002 371

By-Turknett, Carolyn Norris; And Others
The Sociology of Early Childhood Education: A Review of Literature. Technical Report No. 1.
Georgia Univ., Athens. Research and Development Center in Educational Stimulation.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
Report No-GU-RDCES-TR-1
Bureau No-BR-5-0250
Pub Date Jun 69
Contract-OEC-6-10-061
Note-120p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$6.10
Descriptors-Ability, Achievement, *Early Childhood Education, Environmental Influences, Ethnic Groups, Family Influence, Family Structure, Language Development, Mass Media, Parent Attitudes, Parent Influence, Parent Role, *Research Reviews (Publications), Social Class, *Sociology

The principal published research findings and other relevant literature in the sociology of early childhood education are reviewed and summarized in this paper. Part I examines the shaping of a child's abilities and achievement by the norms, roles, and practices of his parents. The influence of parental sex roles on the parent-child relationship is discussed. Part II discusses family influences on achievement. The family structure, now undergoing important changes, affects the educability of the child. In today's smaller family, the child is dependent on the immediate family group rather than a kinship group. Membership in a social class or ethnic group influences values, child-rearing approaches, family organization, and characteristics of the child. Language, social behavior, and social class are also related. Although most of the young child's experience is within the family, there are important extrafamilial influences, which are discussed in Part III as are studies on mass media dealing with socializing and learning effects. Additional research on the effects of peer groups and school environment is recommended. (DR)

ED0 32944

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

BR-5-0250
PA-24

Technical Report No. 1

THE SOCIOLOGY OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION: A REVIEW OF LITERATURE

prepared by
Carolyn Norris Turknett

directed by
Paul E. Kelly
Professor of Sociology and Education
Head, Department of Educational Sociology
University of Georgia

assisted by
Karl King
Associate Professor of Family Development

for the Research and Development Center in Educational Stimulation
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia
June, 1969

This report was prepared as part of the activities of the Research and Development Center in Educational Stimulation, University of Georgia, pursuant to a contract with the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, under Provisions of the Cooperative Research Program.

Center No. 5-0250 Contract No. OE 6-10-061

PS 002371

CONTENTS

Page

Introduction ii

Part 1: Parental influences on the ability and achievement of their children

Section 1: Parental attitudes and achievement 1
Section 2: The influence of parental sex roles 13
Section 3: Parental behavior and achievement 21

Part II: Family influences on achievement

Section 1: Family structure and educability 32

Section 2: Influences of social class and ethnicity on educability

a. Introduction 46
b. The significance of values 51
c. Approach to child rearing and social class 57
d. Race and family organization 60
e. Class differences in achievement-related characteristics of the children 62

Section 3: Language, social class and educability

a. The relevance of language and social class for the development of basic verbal skills 65
b. Language and social behavior 76
c. Conclusion 84

Part III: Extrafamilial influences on the ability and achievement 85
Section 1: Learning and the mass media 85
Section 2: Peer groups and the school environment 94

References

for Part I 100
Part II 106
Part III 114

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to review and summarize the principal published research findings and other relevant literature of particular significance pertaining to what has been categorized for present purposes as "the sociology of early childhood education." It is meant to provide background for staff members in the University of Georgia Research and Development Center in Educational Stimulation, forming a basis for both program development and research.

Research in the sociology of education pertaining to early childhood education--particularly research by recognized sociologists--is quite limited. There is a considerable body of literature, including some very good research, on the sociology of the family, of which some part is relevant. Most of the specific studies in this area of education are to be found in the professional education literature, however. Many of these are only partly sociological and tend to be of uneven quality. Related studies of a psychological nature are more numerous and of at least equal importance so far as early childhood education is concerned. They are not included in the present review, which is limited to sociological considerations, except to the extent that they may have important sociological implications.

Perhaps the single most useful source on the sociology of early childhood, including implications for early childhood education, is The Sociology of Child Development, by the late

James H. S. Bossard and Eleanor Stoker Boll. This book, published by Harper and Row and now in its fourth edition, is suitable as a textbook for a course on the sociology of early child development, for which course it is intended. It also includes information pertinent to the concerns of the Research and Development Center in Educational Stimulation.* The present paper is, however, somewhat more sharply focused on these concerns. Factors relating to school achievement or which seem to explain differences in ability underlying school achievement are given special emphasis. Parental, familial, and peer group influences are explored in connection with such topics as child-rearing practices, family structure, parental roles, and social class. The preschool child is considered from birth and the school child through approximately the first three grades, to about the age of ten.

The library research for this review was completed by Mrs. Carolyn Norris Turknett, under my direction, assisted by Dr. Karl King of the School of Home Economics, a family sociologist.

Paul E. Kelly
Professor of Sociology and Education
Head, Department of Educational
Sociology

Athens, Georgia
June 1, 1969

---

*By coincidence, when this paper was quite far advanced in preparation, a book of similar title was published: Edith W. King and August Kerber, The Sociology of Early Childhood Education, New York, American Book Company, 1968.

PART I

PARENTAL INFLUENCES ON THE ABILITY AND ACHIEVEMENT OF THEIR CHILDREN

Section I

Whether environment or heredity determines intelligence is now certainly a moot question. The genes set wide limits for abilities; experience determines the development within that range. The present problem is that of determining exactly how environment does affect intelligence. What experiences are favorable to intellectual growth? How do the norms, the structures, and the functioning of the social systems which surround the individual affect his achievement and ability? Part I is closely related to the latter question: in it we wish to examine the ways in which the norms, roles, and practices of the first group to which a child belongs--that of mother, father, and child--shape his abilities and achievement behavior.

Parental Attitudes and Achievement

Few things are as important in determining the behavior of members of any social group as the values and attitudes of that group. It is unquestionable (and well supported by research[1] *), that in the social system consisting of parents and children, the

---

*The references to materials quoted or referred to in this report are listed in chronological order at the end of Parts I, II, and III.

attitudes of the parents about child-rearing, their expectations for the child, both in the present and the future, and their attitudes toward institutions outside the family and toward life in general will in turn affect their behavior toward the child and his behavior. We will focus in this section on the effect of parental attitudes upon the achievement of young children between ages three and twelve.

Although it does not relate parental attitudes directly to achievement, a study by Katovsky and associates does indicate clearly that values of parents regarding intellectual performance as evidenced by their concern with their own achievement affect their behavior toward the children in intellectual situations.[2] For mothers, the importance placed on their own ability to perform is positively correlated with that of their daughters and with the amount of praise and criticism given daughters regarding their achievement efforts. The value which fathers placed on intellectual competence was related to their participation in and encouragement of intellectual activities for both sons and daughters. Both fathers' and mothers' individual expectations for performance were related to intellectual participation of daughters only.

Another study drawn from the same large research enterprise of Katovsky et al extends the findings to include the effects of selected parental attitudes about their children's achievement on the actual achievement of the children.[3] Generally, relationships were not strong. Mothers' (and not fathers') evaluations of children's competence were related to the achievement of sons and daughters, but the causal effect of their evaluation is questionable since the mothers had excellent knowledge of school achievement from report cards, conferences, etc. An interesting finding was the fact that mothers' achievement standards for children were related to daughters' achievement only, while fathers' standards had no effect on achievement of children of either sex.

Another study designed to measure the effect of "maternal acceleration" on the IQ of three- and six-year-olds showed a *cross*-sex relationship.[4] While maternal acceleration was operationally defined in terms of behavioral as well as attitudinal variables, a significant aspect of it was the mother's concern with the child's physical growth, intellectual development, and achievement during the first three years, and maternal acceleration was significantly related (positively) *only* to the IQ of *boys* aged three. The vague factor "concern with intellectual performance" obviously is made up of many separate components, and the various aspects need to be clearly delineated and their effects determined. It is also evident that the maternal and paternal attitudes may differentially influence not only very young boys and girls but children of different ages.

Several studies have related the child's achievement to broad general scales of parental attitudes and to the parent's basic orientation to the parent-child relationship. In one of the studies Biglin found that parental attitudes measured by the Nebraska Parental Attitude scale were not significantly related to any measure of achievement of fourth-grade children.[5] In the same study, however, teachers were asked to rate attitudes of parents as "Dominant, Disinterested, or Democratic." Significant differences appeared using this method. It was found that achievement scores of children of parents rated as dominant or disinterested were significantly lower than those of children whose parents held democratic attitudes. Dominant and disinterested attitudes were also significantly negatively correlated with scales measuring characteristics important for achievement (e.g., creativity and intellectual maturity) and with such indices of social accomplishment as social and emotional maturity, friendship ratings, and withdrawal scores. The methodology of the study could certainly be questioned, and conclusions should be viewed warily. The American value system would indicate that democratic attitudes are best, and teachers imbued with this cultural system probably would expect parents of high-achieving children to have democratic attitudes. To ask them to rate parents when they are familiar with the achievement scores of the children and can control the outcome of the study is risky no matter how "objective" the teachers believe themselves to be.

The advisibility of caution in making conclusive statements in this area is further supported by Drews and Teahan, whose results directly contradict those of Biglin. Using 30 items from a Parental Attitude Survey by Shoben, attitudes on "Dominating, Possessive, and Ignoring" subscales were measured. Here, parents of high achievers scored significantly higher on the Dominating and Ignoring subscales. No significant relations were found between scores on the Possessive scale and achievement. The children used in this study were slightly older than Biglin's subjects, however, and this could confound results. An interesting point not brought out by the authors was the fact that while parents of high achievers were high on dominating and ignoring scales, in both the high and low achieving groups, parents of gifted children (IQ's 130 or more on Stanford-Binet) had lower scores on all three subscales.

A study by Chance related a similar dimension of parental attitudes to the child's achievement and reported results similar to the results of Drews and Teahan regarding domination.[7] Mothers' attitudes toward independence training were determined by asking them at what age they believed children should be allowed to or be able to do certain things. Children whose mothers favored late independence training were significantly higher in first-grade achievement. Achievement was measured here, however, by difference between achievement and intelligence rank, and no data were given on the relationship of the attitude variable to IQ. Chance's study was designed to test the applicability of Winterbottom's conclusions relating parental attitudes about independence and

PS 002371

achievement *need* to the relationship of attitudes about independence and actual school achievement. Winterbottom, using the same type of parental attitude measure used later by Chance and measuring achievement need with a TAT type fantasy test, found that children whose mothers favored *early* independence training had higher achievement need.[8] Some researchers have found[9] and others have assumed that achievement is highly correlated with independence (when intelligence is held constant). The contradictory results of Winterbottom and Chance indicate that this assumption needs further testing. Replication of the studies on identical populations would also be useful in pointing up discrepancies due to methodological differences.

It should be stated that much research similar to that described above has been done in the area relating social class and achievement (parental attitudes differ greatly by social class) and in the area dealing with parental control practices or home "atmosphere" and achievement. In determining practices and atmosphere, many studies have used techinques similar to those used in the above studies for measuring attitudes. We have chosen to classify the research according to the stated purpose of the authors. The research purporting to measure actual behavior will be discussed under a topic dealing with parental behavior and achievement, and discussion of social class attitudinal differences will also be reserved for a later section.

Related to attitudes about specific factors like possessiveness or independence is a more comprehensive and integrated collection of attitudes which some researchers have called the family ideology. It might be called a general orientation toward child-rearing and as such would be expected to determine many other specific attitudes and practices. Evelyn Duvall developed this idea around 1946 and termed the various idealogies differing "conception of parenthood."[10] After asking respondents to name five things a good mother does and five things a good child does, she discovered that responses tended to fall into two major categories, and from these she postulated two major conceptions of parenthood: 1) the traditional and 2) the nontraditional or developmental. The traditional parent desires those things in a child which have been traditionally valued: obedience, respect, and neatness; and he believes that his duty as a parent is to inculcate these characteristics in the child and to teach the child to please and to obey adults at all times. On the other hand, the developmentally oriented parent focuses on the growth of the child; such a parent wants the child to be eager to learn, to be happy, and to develop self-control. Emphasis is placed not on the child's relation to adults but on his own development.

Duvall's concepts have proved to be a useful distinction in research, and M. L. Kohn has used them extensively in his work dealing with social class and parent-child relationships.[11] There is little or no research directly relating parenthood ideology and early achievement in the child. Duvall, however, found that parents in lower social classes more often gave traditional responses, while parents of higher status were more often developmental in orientation. Kohn's later and more extensive research corroborates Duvall's conclusions and will be more completely discussed in a later section. It is important to note here, however, that since it is a well-documented fact that lower-class children score lower on both measures of ability and measures of achievement, it might be hypothesized that a developmental ideology is conducive to cognitive development. Further, indirect support for the hypothesis is added by studies which have shown that children who internalize adult standards (as do children of developmentally oriented parents) are often high achievers.[12] Direct testing of the relationship between ideology and achievement would add significantly to our knowledge.

Several researchers have found that the child's performance is affected by the parents' attitudes toward the school and schooling and by the extent to which they themselves value intellectual performance. In a very comprehensive study of the relationship of home background to ability and attainment in the school, J. W. B. Douglas dealt with the effect of parental encouragement, which he treats as an attitudinal variable, and interest on performance.[13] Parental interest in the school was determined by teachers' ratings and by the number of times the parent visited the school, and it was assumed that high scores on these measures indicated a positive attitude toward the school. As we shall see later, social class has a strong influence on parental valuing of the school, but Douglas found that even *within* each social class those children whose parents showed high interest in school scored higher on both intelligence and achievement tests. The study was a longitudinal one involving English children born in 1946, and two important measures of ability were the tests for 8-year-olds and the 11+ exams which most English children take. It was interesting that the advantage of the children of interested parents increased from the exam. for the 8-year-olds to the 11+ one and was a more important factor in determining achievement than size of family, home standards, or academic record of the school attended.

Douglas also relates the intellectual performance of children to another important aspect of the parents' attitudes--their aspirations for the children.[14] Since the study took place in Britain, where college education is not so commonplace as in the United States, the parents' choice of secondary school was used as the measure of height of aspiration. The results were quite startling, especially for a sample of over 4,000. At all levels of scores on the 11+ exam., children of mothers who definitely wished their children to attend a grammar school were much more likely to actually attend one. (The grammar school is the most prestigious type of secondary school and the one by far most likely to lead to higher education.) Douglas summarizes the findings in this way: after taking account of ability, social class and geographical area, "children whose mothers want them to go to grammar school and stay there until they are seventeen get 11 percent more grammar school places than expected, those whose mothers are undecided get 8 percent fewer places than expected, and those whose mothers want them to go to secondary modern schools and leave early get 60 percent fewer places than expected."[15]

These findings have been generally borne out by other researchers. Rosen and D'Andrade, by observing 40 boys, aged 6 to 11, who were engaged in some task and with mothers present, found that mothers of highest achievers held higher aspirations and expectations for their children than the mother of low achievers.[16] Generally, the children were more concerned with performance and set higher standards. Small parts of two very comprehensive studies relating intellectual ability and performance to home environment also support this proposition. Dave, using grade-school children, found that high-achieving children had parents who expected much and had high aspirations for their children.[17] Wolf found that similar parental attitudes were also related to high intelligence.[18]

Several studies have been completed using adolescents as subjects and their results, in general, confirm what the somewhat less ambitious studies on younger children have indicated.* In his well-known research on Italian and Jewish families, Strodtbeck found that Jewish parents, whose sons were by far the higher achievers, had very high educational and occupational aspirations for their children, while aspirations of Italian parents were generally low.[19] Rosen, also concerned with boys (of adolescent age and younger) from ethnic groups which usually differ greatly in achievement and upward mobility, found, as predicted, that Jewish, Greek, and Protestant vocational aspirations of mothers for sons were higher than those of Italians, French Canadians, and Negroes.[20] Except for Negro mothers, whose aspirations were higher than expected, educational aspirations followed the same pattern. It should be noted that in neither of these studies was variance primarily attributable to ethnic group; in both, controlling for social class greatly decreased differences.

Strodtbeck also brings out another constellation of attitudes, variously designated as degree of fatalism or perceived mastery of the environment, which has often been associated with achievement and achievement motivation. He reported that, among both Jewish and Italian families, sons of fathers who believed in man's ability to control the external world, who did not believe that destiny might twist all plans, and who were more loyal to the larger social group than to the family were significantly higher achievers than sons of family-oriented fathers who did not believe in the efficacy of planning. This fatalistic outlook is common among lower-class members of all ethnic groups[21] and would help explain their lower motivation to achieve. If control of the environment is impossible and success dictated only by fate, striving is certainly useless.

---

*It should be noted that most of the research in this area deals, as does a large part of all research on achievement, with the effect of aspirations on boys. Much less is known about the consequences of parental attitudes or behavior on girls, and the meager research which does deal with the problem suggests that the relationships may be entirely different.

Although we have by no means exhausted the field, an attempt has been made to discuss the most important and relevant research. While it is evident that the relation of parental attitudes to the achievement of the child is a fruitful area for study, as yet the number of well-documented findings is small. Future researchers in the area should be careful to define attitudinal variables more precisely, and to consider thoroughly the applicability of measures used for the problem in hand. The scope of the research in the area needs to be expanded: effects on each sex should be determined and the possibility that age is a significant intervening variable should be considered. Finally, effects of each attitude or constellation of attitudes on ability, achievement, and achievement motivation should be considered separately, since there is some indication that they have different antecedents.

Section 2

The Influence of Parental Sex Roles

The past few decades have seen an unprecedented change in the nature and function of the family. The decline of the extended family, the change in function from a productive to a consuming unit, the development of romantic love and companionship as the basis for marriage--all these (and many others) have been topics of growing sociological interest during the past few years. Changes in parental roles have been concomitant with changes in the family as a whole, and these also have received much attention. The effects of such changes on the parent-child relationship are of course of interest to us here, but it should also be noted that concentration of attention in this area has led to a certain distortion in the field. Research and theory have been focused largely on pathological conditions arising from rapid changes, and the assumption has often been made that the change is "bad" or "unnatural" and, therefore, bound to have detrimental effects on the child. Little objective research has been done on the consequences accruing to the children because of various role models, and the research that has been done has concentrated largely on consequences for the child's personality rather than for his ability or achievement. Realizing, then, the difficulties inherent in our task, we shall attempt to discuss such topics as the role of the mother and the role of the father, acquisition of the sex role by children and the effect of consequent identification on ability, and the effects of different parental-role definitions or behaviors on the child.

Before we can begin to understand why the same behavior from the mother and father may elicit different consequences or why indentification with one sex role rather than the other may inhibit or strengthen achieving behavior, we must develop some idea of the nature of maternal and paternal roles in present-day society. Perhaps the most influential theoretical sociological statement in this area has come from Talcott Parsons.[22] Parsons points out that, as Bales found in small-group research,[23] every group similar in size to the nuclear family develops two types of leaders--an instrumental leader and an expressive leader. In the nuclear family the male is the instrumental leader; his role is task oriented, and he must accept primary responsibility for the support of the family. He is irrevocably bound up in the occupational system, and the status and style of life of his family is derived from his position within it. He has other important functions within the family, but the most important one is unquestionably his role as "breadwinner."

The expressive or socio-emotional role, subordinated in the family at least to the instrumental role, is taken by the wife and mother. Her focus is inward on the family: she is expected to love them, to care for personal needs, and "to develop the skills in human relations which are central to making the home harmonious and pleasant."[24] The maternal role is supportive, more passive than the male's, and emotional in tone. Parsons argues that recent changes in the nuclear family have reinforced this differentiation. The decline of the family as a productive unit and the separation of the occupational system from the family have served to focus the instrumental role sharply on the adult male. The absence of the father during the day and the decline of the extended family have placed responsibility for the emotionally charged child-care function directly on the mother, thereby intensifying her expressive role. He sees no change due to an increase of women in the labor force; most married women with children still do not work and most jobs held by women have supportive, expressive characteristics (e.g. nurse, teacher, secretary).

Bossard and Boll basically see the roles in the same way. A study by Boll indicates that most of the mother's time is indeed spent in serving family, home, friends and community.[25] She found that mothers were almost all strictly family-oriented and spent a great deal of time "counseling" children. Bossard and Boll emphasize also that most recent empirical research has shown that by far the most important function of the father is that of breadwinner.[26] These authors differ from Parsons, howe3er, in that they see the roles as less stable and strictly defined. They see the father's absence from the home due to the necessity of fulfilling his breadwinning role outside the family as leading to increased maternal dominance, which in turn leads to increased conflict and frustration.[27]

Bossard and Boll also believe that problems and frustrations are caused by increased demands in the mother role which have not been matched by increased status. With regard to the father's role, they see his recent daily absence from the family as lessening his authority and importance in the family. In some ways they seem to feel that the roles are becoming less clearly delineated, and they contend that adjustments will be necessary in both roles in the future.[28]

As stated in our introduction to this section, little has been done relating parental role definitions to achievement. Studies relating parental roles to personality development may be relevant, however, since a "healthy" personality is probably necessary for achievement. The findings of Henry indicate that adherence to Parsonian role models is salutory for development of boys. He found that when the father was the primary source of authority and the mother the source of affection, boys were high in aggressive responses (a trait which has been associated with high achievement), while boys whose mothers were sources of authority and affection were high in self-punitiveness and anxiety.[29] Hoffman also found that boys from father-dominant homes were high in aggressiveness (and in initiation of friendships).[30]

Findings for girls, however, are much less clear cut. Bronfenbrenner found that girls are more dependable when the mother is the chief authority figure,[31] while Hoffman found that such girls had difficult relations with boys and were too low on impulsivity and aggression.[32] A study by Crandall and associates indicates that mothers high on affection may not have positive effects on a girl's achievement.[33] They found, among early grade-school children, that daughters of mothers low on nurturance and affection were the most competent readers. The same relationship did not hold for boys. Several tentative explanations were given, one of which takes into account the differential effect on boys and girls. They suggest that less nurturant mothers are more achievement-oriented themselves, and girls who identify with them are thereby motivated to achieve. It is possible that acceptance of a fully expressive role by mothers may decrease achievement in daughters.

The maternal role has long received more attention since it has been assumed that the mother has the greater effect on the child. The aspect of this role which has been most discussed is that caused by maternal employment. Although research is plentiful in this area, confusion is rampant. Research does indicate that both division of labor in the home and the power relation are changed somewhat. Husbands of working wives are more likely to participate in "home-making" tasks, and while working mothers participate less in day-to-day household decisions, they have more voice in the major economic decisions.[34] Conclusions as to the effect of maternal employment on the child's ability or achievement are much less clear cut. Hoffman reports that intellectual performance of third-through sixth-grade children of working mothers was significantly less than that of children of non-working mothers.[35] Burchinal's findings are somewhat inconclusive; most correlations of maternal employment during various periods of the child's life with his intelligence or achievement were negative, but since all were very low and few reached significance, Burchinal was reluctant to draw conclusions.[36] He also noted that much of the variation was eliminated when socio-economic level was controlled. Francena Nolan's findings are in the opposite direction.[37] In the age group 6 to 11 years, a positive but non-significant advantage was held by children of working mothers and among children aged 12 and over, those from homes with working mothers were significantly higher in achievement. The effects of this significant alteration of the maternal role are by no means clearly delineated, although it is certain that they do not appear to be as drastically detrimental as was once thought.

The sex role is important not only as a guideline for parental behavior but also as the child's model for identification. Identification with the proper sex role has, in itself, very important consequences for later achievement of the child. During primary grades, girls excel in academic tasks, but the ability of boys compared with girls increases with increasing age, especially in areas requiring analytical reasoning (e.g., math and science).[38] These differences in ability seem to be acquired rather than inherent: such phenomena as the increase of girls' reasoning ability when problems are stated in terms of cooking rather than geometry suggest that they are closely linked to differing sex role definitions.[39]

It has frequently been suggested that the initial disadvantage of the boys is due to the excessively feminine atmosphere of the elementary school.[40] Several studies have indicated that for the young boy the masculine role is not clearly and positively defined in itself but is presented and perceived simply as the opposite of the feminine one. Brim found that boys expressed their masculinity not by high ratings on masculine traits but by very low scores on traits associated with the feminine role.[41] Hartley found a good deal of confusion and frustration among young boys; they were unsure about what they should do and strained to be masculine by meticulously avoiding anything defined as feminine.[42] This, Hartley concludes, leads to hostility not only toward all things feminine but toward all females. Certainly this could lead to rejection of the primary-grade teacher and of her values for achievement.

As the children mature, however, the situation is reversed. The boy realizes that fulfillment of his sex role demands vocational success, and academic accomplishment is a prerequisite for this. The girl's motivation to achieve is dependent on maintenance of a love relationship, not on academic skills.[43] It is also quite possible that many girls feel that academic competition is not compatible with the supportive, subordinate nature of their roles. This is congruent with Crandall's findings that high-achieving girls have mothers low on nurturance, since these girls would not see the female role as primarily expressive and would value achievement as a means of fulfilling their role.

It should be stressed in conclusion that we do think the field dealing with the relationships among parental roles, sex roles, identification, and acquisition by children and the child's achievement is a promising one. Future attention should be focused not so much on pathological conditions and consequences as, objectively, on ways in which normal children are influenced in their intellectual development.

Section 3

Parental Behavior and Achievement

Parental child-rearing techniques and the extent and nature of parent-child interaction have been the subject of much scientific scrutiny. Many studies have focused on consequences for the child's personality; some have considered effects on early childhood ability and achievement. Again, certain statements can be made, few of them conclusive, but a review of relevant research should serve to point up visible trends and highlight areas of confusion.

Probably the study by Dave has successfully related the largest number of variables to the child's achievement.[44] After study of the literature, he isolated six "Environmental Process Variables" which should affect the child's achievement and operationalized each by determining several easily measurable components. The six variables were: 1) achievement press (reflected by such things as parental aspirations, parental standards and rewards for achievement, and knowledge of the child's progress); 2) language modes (determined by the quality of the parents' language, opportunities given the child for enlargement of vocabulary and sentence patterns, and keenness of parents for correct usage); 3) academic guidance (or the availability and quality of parental guidance on school work and the availability of material related to learning); 4) the activeness of the family (determined by the extent and nature of activities and by use of books, television, and the like); 5) the intellectuality of the home, and 6) the work habits of the home. Ratings on each variable were made for 60 families of fifth-grade children, and a summated score (denoted as the Educational Environment) correlated impressively (.799) with the child's achievement.

Wolf, in a similar study using the same sample, developed an environmental index which correlated .69 with the child's IQ score.[45] While the index as a whole was the best predictor of IQ, he found that individually scales dealing with: 1) the parents' intellectual expectations for the child and their information regarding his intellectual development, 2) opportunities provided for enlarging the child's vocabulary, and 3) the extent to which parents created learning situations in the home and gave assistance in learning were most highly correlated with the child's ability.

Both of these studies found a factor somewhat vaguely called "activeness of the family" to be of significant importance in the child's development. Several studies have corroborated the fact that homes in which there is a high degree of parent-child interaction and a wide variety of activities for the child have a notably stimulating effect on intellectual ability. Baldwin found that an active home, "characterized by a high level of interaction between the parent and the child,"[46] is more likely, even at the nursery-school level to produce active, curious, aggressive children who, by responding actively toward the environment, are able to develop intellectually.[47] Milner's results were similar.[48] She found that first-grade children whose parents read to them, talked to them, took them places, and further stimulated them by providing them with books, scored significantly higher on reading and language tests. Mealtime conversation was found to be particularly important, and it should be noted that among high scorers conversation was two-way--mothers talked with children, while low-scoring mothers, if they spoke at all, simply gave orders or reprimanded their children.

The fact that home environment is related to the educability of the child is now accepted by most researchers, and the problem now is (as it was primarily for Wolf and Dave) the exact delineation of the dimensions of the environment and the development of precise measures of it. Georgianne Baker who, like Wolf and Dave, was associated with the University of Chicago "Cognitive Environments of Urban Pre-School Children" project, used a "resource patterning" approach in developing a scale measuring aspects of the home environment related to the child's educability.[49] The product is a good example of work done in the field, and further explication of the general procedure would probably be useful.

Resources were defined as "objects, events, or human beings within the child's environment that are available and that function to influence his educability."[50] It is, however, resource patterns that are for Baker the fruitful units for study. Patterns refer to the way in which "availability and utilization of resources are patterned or interrelated,"[51] and she is especially interested in isolating those particularly relevant for educability.

Baker developed a list of thirty resources and summarized these into nine resource patterns, which were in turn organized as parts of three "qualities of the home" which determined the "educative capacity" of the home. A home high in educative capacity was defined as one in which "the child experiences minimum physical constriction and maximum mental stimulation and social interaction because of patterning of learning resources"[52] (author's emphasis).

Rating scales for each of the nine patterns were based on the assumption that all patterns had availability and utilization dimensions which could each be rated as to quality and quantity. If, for example, the quality of the utilization pattern of a particular resource was felt to be directed toward educability, it was given a (+) rating; if not a (-). The completed measurement model did differentiate quite significantly among individual children and among social status groups, and this seems a valid way of operationalizing the educative capacity of the home.

Bing's study of parental stimulation and parent-child interaction further stresses the importance of these factors.[53] In a comprehensive analysis which included many of the variables considered by Wolf and Dave, Bing found that verbal stimulation by the mother (talking, reading, and playing with the child) and interest shown in the child's accomplishment were significantly related to high verbal ability for boys and for both sexes combined. As in the Milner study, participation in mealtime conversation was positively related to verbal ability. Results for the portion of the study dealing with antecedents of nonverbal ability were less clear, although a combination of measures dealing with opportunities for object experimentation, availability of tools, and so on was, for boys, positively associated with nonverbal ability.

The very great significance of early parental stimulation is further attested to by programs in which very small changes in parental behavior have measurably affected the child's intellectual progress. In one such program, children whose mothers spent ten minutes daily reading to them from their first birthday until they reached twenty months showed significant intellectual improvement when compared to children who had received no such treatment.[54]

Work by Robert Hess, Virginia Shipman, and others also emphasizes the extreme importance of patterns of mother-child interaction. Hess has shown that maternal "teaching styles" (which are conditioned primarily by language styles) and other aspects of the communication between mother and child measurably affect the cognitive behavior of the child. His problem-solving abilities, his attitudes toward the school and toward himself, his motivation to achieve--all are closely related to mother-child interaction.[55]

The relevance of this factor has caused some researchers to believe that preschool programs in educational stimulation (especially for disadvantaged children) should be focused on the mother as well as on the child. David Weikart points out that much research has shown that children who attend preschool classes lose their initial advantage by third grade, and suggests that a very plausible reason for this is that such programs leave the very important mother-child relationship at home unchanged.[56] In a study designed to determine the feasibility and effectiveness of a preschool program which attempted to restructure the mother-child interaction pattern, Weikart found that a method involving the mother and child at home brought significant improvement. Teachers spent 1 1/2 hours per week for twelve weeks with 35 culturally disadvantaged mothers and their four-year-old children and worked at altering language patterns, teaching methods, and child-control techniques. At the conclusion of the study mean Stanford-Binet IQ's of the experimental group had increased 8.00 points, while the mean of the matched control group was a slight 0.08 points higher. The difference in means was significant at the p .01 level, and this certainly suggests that the possibilities of programs of this type should be further investigated.

In only one study do we find slightly contradictory results. Crandall and associates found that for second-, third-, and fourth-grade children, parents of high-achieving girls were less prone to encourage intellectual activities, and participation of parents in intellectual pursuits with the child was found to be negatively (but not significantly) associated with the child's achievement.[57] The authors suggest, however, that since most measures of participation and encouragement dealt with school-related activities, they could have been the result of parental knowledge of poor achievement rather than antecedents of the child's development.

Another of Dave's variables, parental language mode, has been shown to be of the utmost importance in facilitating or hampering the child's intellectual development. Since language usage has been closely linked to social class and race, however, we will reserve discussion of its effect on the child until Part II of this study.

No discussion of parental behavior and child-rearing practices would be complete without consideration of the effects of differing disciplinary methods and orientations toward child control. Little research attention has been focused recently on specific disciplinary techniques, but a word on the subject would probably be useful. The physical-nonphysical distinction proved to be somewhat useless from a research standpoint, and Aronfreed's Induction-Sensitization dimension is probably more fruitful.[58] Induction or love-oriented techniques (e.g. reasoning and explanation) are those which arouse unpleasant feelings in the child independent of external threats. Sensitization techniques (e.g., spanking or yelling), however, simply inhibit the child's behavior by focusing on the painful consequences which will ensue. No specific relation between these techniques and achievement has been established, but induction techniques were found by

Aronfreed to lead to acceptance of responsibility for actions, a trait often found to be associated with high achievement.

Most recent research in the area of discipline has focused not on techniques but on such general dimensions as "permissiveness" or "restrictiveness" of the family and the democratic or autocratic atmosphere of the home. Many findings in the area, however, are contradictory, and generally the relationship of parental control to the achievement, intelligence, or personality of the child is quite indeterminate.

Research relating achievement to the permissiveness-restrictiveness dimension is highly inconclusive. Watson found that children reared in permissive homes had characteristics generally associated with achievement (independence, persistence, acceptance of responsibility for behavior, and creativity), while those from restrictive homes were dependent, low in persistence, and uncreative.[59] Hoffman, Rosen, and Lippitt, however, found support for their hypothesis that boys (third through sixth grade) with coercive parents would--if granted autonomy--develop hostility and a need for self-assertion and be consequently higher in achievement than other children.[60] A third conclusion was reached by Spector, who (in a rather poorly designed and presented study) found no relationship between achievement and parental permissiveness for junior-high school children.[61]

Wesley Becker has suggested that other dimensions of parental control must be considered when studying permissiveness. He believes that the omission of these factors has been the primary source of the contradictory findings in the area.[62] One major dimension which Becker feels must necessarily be added is that of warmth vs. hostility, and he concludes (primarily from the research of others) that warm-permissive homes lead to the greatest intellectual development and achievement. The advisability of distinguishing the two dimensions and considering the effects of their interaction has been borne out in other research.[63]

The work done by Baldwin is closely related to that discussed above, except that he considers family democracy as well as parental control.[64] His primary concern is with the effect of democracy ("characterized by a high level of verbal contact between parent and child appearing as consultation about policy decisions, as explanation of reasons for family rules, and as verbal explanations in response to the child's curiosity") and control ("the existence of restrictions upon behavior which are clearly conveyed to the child"[65]) on the "activeness" or "maturity of the child." The activeness is defined as a "willingness and ability to respond actively toward his environment"[66] and is a quality necessary for creativity, curiosity, and achievement. He found that democracy (when control is kept constant) tends to increase the activeness of the child, while high parental control decreases it. These results are consistent with those of Baldwin, Kalhorn, and Breese, who found that children from "Acceptant-Democratic-Indulgent" homes have higher IQ's than those from autocratic or rejectant homes.[67] This finding also supports the hypothesis of Becker stated above.

There are undoubtedly many inconsistencies in the studies discussed. This possibly is at least in part due to their rather general lack of theoretical basis and precisely defined concepts. Certainly the inconsistency in definitions and measurements decreases the comparability of the studies. Baldwin considered democracy and control to be two aspects of permissiveness.[68] Spector's permissiveness factor, however, was related to parental control over friends, spending money, hours, etc., and was measured by questions quite similar to those used by Hoffman, Rosen, and Lippitt in measuring autonomy. Firm as opposed to permissive control has also been defined as the extent to which parents expect conformance to adult standards of behavior, particularly in areas like care of household items and inhibition of noise.[69]

Many researchers have used words common to the layman's vocabularly seemingly without realizing that concepts need much more precise definition in scientific research. Independence, for example, in its non-scientific application, can mean at least two quite different things: 1) ability and permission to make one's own decisions, and 2) ability to care for one's own physical needs. Researchers have not stated their own definitions precisely, and it is obvious from measuring instruments used that some assume one meaning and some the other. Similar arguments apply regarding use of other concepts (e.g., "permissiveness" and "control"), and it is not at all surprising that results seem to be incompatible.

While there are many problems yet to be solved in dealing with parental control and the child's intellectual development and achievement, it should not be assumed that all research relating parental behavior and educability of the child is worthless. Much excellent work has been done and should be continued, especially in the very promising area dealing with parental educational stimulation of the child. This is an area which may not only add to our theoretical knowledge and to our practical ability but also help to develop methods for improving the intellectual performance of children.

PART II

FAMILY INFLUENCES ON ACHIEVEMENT

Section I

Family Structure and Educability

Only parental influences were discussed in Part I. Attention will now be turned to the influence of characteristics which might be thought of as belonging to the family as a social system. We will first consider the relationship of family structure and educability.

Every continuing social group has an observable structure; it has a size, a certain number of parts, and a set of relatively well-defined roles corresponding to these parts. The form, the size, and the relationship between the parts of any group will in some measure limit and determine the interaction within the group, the way the group affects its members, and the way they perceive the group. These general observations are equally applicable to the family group.

Many significant changes have occurred in the American family recently, but only the two which bear most directly on the purpose of this paper will be noted. The first "...is the growing emphasis on the immediate family rather than the kinship group family; the other is the declining size of the family."[70]

In simple, noncomplex societies the kinship group performs a wide variety of functions from child rearing to educational and occupational training, to caring for the aged. As societies become more complex, the kinship group transfers some of its functions to institutions which have been created to meet the changing needs of a complex society. Hence children are sent to public schools for educational and occupational training, and agencies are established to administer to the welfare of the aged and infirm. In general, with "...this process of functional differentiation, the kinship unit gradually comes to have fewer functions which it performs for individuals and for the society, and at the same time it becomes more highly specialized."[71]

With a reduction in the number of functions performed, the socialization process and personality development take on more importance and become more intense in their interpersonal nature within the nuclear family of father, mother, and unmarried child. From the viewpoint of the small child his "...emotional attachments are confined to the few people in his immediate family instead of being diffused over a wider group, with the consequence that parent-child relations are highly charged with feeling."[72]

Family size has decreased as the family has moved from a rural oriented society, where children were an economic asset, to an urban society, where children are an economic liability. For example, in 1870, the average number of persons per household was 5.7, in 1900, 4.8, and in 1960, 3.3.[73] The total birth rate declined from 1870 to 1940, rose somewhat erratically until 1955 (probably due particularly to the lowering of the age of child bearing). It has been dropping steadily since that time. The size of the average husband-wife family seems to be becoming stabilized at about 3.7. Since size seems to be an important structural character of any group and especially of the family, this changing trend is likely to significantly affect relationships within the family and the behavior and attributes of the children.

It seems fitting, then, to open our discussion of the effects of structure on ability and achievement with a consideration of the differential effects of size on the educability of the child. James Bossard and Eleanor Boll are probably the primary contributors in this area, and much of the material used here will be drawn from their work.[74] Almost every group, they note, is thought to have an optimum size or range of sizes. The number of people in any group severely restricts and determines the amount, type, and direction of interaction that can take place within it. This is certainly no less true in a family group: we would certainly expect the "small-family system" of recent decades to be not just quantitatively but qualitatively different from the traditional large-family pattern. Bossard and Boll list several characteristics of small families, and while they do not specifically concentrate on the consequences of these for achievement, it seems evident that such relationships exist. The first differentiating characteristic of a small family is its unique theme. Planning is the dominant value--planning of size and spacing of children, planning of child-rearing programs, and planning for the future education and occupation of the children. Achievement is stressed and we have noted previously (see Part I, Sections 1 and 3)that both emphasis on education and achievement and belief in the possibility of planning are likely to lead to high-achievement motivation in children. Bossard and Boll stress, however, that this achievement orientation may not have entirely positive consequences: many parents impose their own unfulfilled ambitions upon their children, thereby exerting pressures which may create serious emotional problems for the children.

Other characteristics of the small family are intimate interaction and a democratic atmosphere. While such democracy has been found by most researchers to lead to high achievement, Bossard and Boll note that a consequence of this characteristic, the individual emphasis on family roles, may lead to inability of the members to perform effectively in the large-scale, non-individualized (bureaucratic) organizations common in our society. The school is one such institution, and adjustment to it, if not success within it, may be hampered by socialization in a small family. It should be mentioned, however, that this opinion is not held by all sociologists; indeed, some professionals (see Section III, this Part) believe that this individualization is a consequence of a particular language mode which is a definite asset in school success.

Bossard and Boll unquestionably imply that the small family system produces an emotionally less well-adjusted child, regardless of its consequences for his achievement and ability. The large family, on the other hand, is characterized by lack of planning or stress on achievement, frequent financial problems, emphasis on the group rather than the individual, and greater stress on rules and discipline. These characteristics may indeed make for a better "adjusted" child, aware and acceptant of "the realities of life" and well able to function effectively in large groups. It is unlikely, however, that an environment where "conformity is valued above self-expression" and "listening is the rule rather than talking"[75] will produce a child high in achievement or ability.

Many of the relationships between family size and intellectual performance suggested above have been supported by other research. Rosen, studying boys from 8-14, found that achievement motivation decreases with increasing size, and that small families are likely to emphasize self-reliant mastery.[76] He also notes that such a family is likely to be more democratic and to place less stress on obedience. Rosen has also set forth the very interesting hypothesis that value similarity of parents and children (regardless of the specific values) is higher in small families.[77] Such families stress early independence training for children and use love-oriented disciplinary techniques, and such factors tend to create anxiety in the child and to motivate him to internalize parental values to insure nurturnace.

Ability to achieve as well as motivation to do so also seem to be inversely related to family size. Douglas found that children from small families were more likely to attend British grammar schools than were those from large families.[78] Lees and Stewart, using the same measure of ability, reached a similar conclusion.[79] That group size is a determinant of verbal behavior in children is supported by Williams and Mattson,[80] and Nisbet[81] has shown that this is no less the case in the family group. He hypothesized that since verbal ability seems to be enhanced by contact with adults, children from large families, who are limited in such contacts, should score lower on verbal tests of intelligence. Significantly, he proposed also that this relationship would hold (to a lesser degree) for nonverbal tests of intelligence, since "the ability to manipulate verbal symbol (sic) seems to play an important part in the process of thinking, and particularly in problem solving.[82] The results supported his hypothesis: correlations of family size with English scores and verbal IQ scores were significantly negative, and although the relationship was not as great, the direction was sustained (and r was still significant) using nonverbal tests.

Empirical evidence also supports Bossard and Boll's suggestion that parental control, a factor possibly related to intellectual development, is correlated with family size. Elder and Bowerman found that children from large families (excluding lower class boys) saw both parents as more autocratic than those from small households.[83] Use of physical punishment and ridicule as disciplinary measures rose significantly with increase in size of family, and parental explanations for behavior decreased. Parents in large families did not require or desire self-control from the child; they "imposed a system of controls designed to elicit obedience."[84] Such behavior should also, as Bossard and Boll state, increase conformity, and in such a situation creative problem-solving behavior is likely to diminish.

Many of Bossard and Boll's tentative hypotheses about effects of family size on children fall in the realm of personality and for this reason are not considered here. Some personality factors, however, are surely related to performance in school, and many of these relationships seem not to have been sufficiently tested. We know little as yet about the relative ability of children from large and small families to adjust to school, and such information is obviously of great importance in assessing their ability to perform in the situation.

Although little work has been done in relating age of parents and the age distribution of children to the educability of the child, the scanty material available indicates that age structure is an influential variable. Rosen found the relationship of age of mother to achievement motivation in the child to be very complex. In a 1961 study he hypothesized that younger mothers, because they are less nurturant and require earlier self-reliance, would be more likely to have highly motivated sons than would older mothers.[85] The hypothesis was borne out only for small families in the middle class. As family size increased and status decreased, motivation of sons of older mothers became higher. In his later study dealing with structure and value transmission, he hypothesized that since younger mothers trained for independence earlier, values of their children would show high similarity to mother's values.[86] He found instead that children of older mothers had higher value similarity and concluded that, while younger mothers did train for independence earlier, they were not less nurturant than older mothers. Obviously, variables were not working in the way supposed by Rosen, and one might indeed question his rather simple, behavioristic explanation of the development of achievement motivation (see discussion on family size). The problem might also lie in definition of "independence training." This is a complex phenomenon with many dissimilar aspects, and one must be careful to distinguish forced physical independence from encouragement of indepencence in thought and choice.

Studies dealing with age intervals between children, while still infrequent, are somewhat more numerous than those concerned with age of parents. Viewing all work in the field, it seems better to view spacing as strictly an intervening variable in its relation to educability rather than as one with any specific, determinable influence on ability. Often it has been found to be of no consequence at all. Schoononer found that age interval little affected the differential in sibling IQ and achievement scores,[87] and Brim detected no differences due to spacing in the ability of one sibling to assimilate sex role traits of the other.[88]

Koch found that while age intervals were not important in themselves, differences in mental ability of siblings owing to sex and birth order were pronounced only at certain spacings.[89] Generally, significant differences in other variables (sex, birth order) were found only with age differentials of over two years. Koch's study should serve to point up the necessity for considering *interactions* as well as main effects.

Psychologists since Adler have focused much attention on effects of birth order on the development of the child, and interest has quickened in the last few years. Most of the studies have dealt with the personality of the child or with variables only indirectly related to intellectual development and performance; some have dealt directly with the consequences of birth order for ability and achievement.

Bossard and Boll stress primarily the relationship of birth order for role expectations and the consequences of these for the personality of the child.[90] Many of their observations, however, could well have implications for our interests and some of these will be enumerated. The eldest child is expected to be the family leader--the one who does things first and best. This may well explain, they note, the documented fact that eldest children appear more frequently in such compilations as *Who's Who* and seem generally to succeed more often. The middle child, however, is neither leader nor baby, and although such children occassionally strive relentlessly to catch up with the eldest, they may never develop a sense of their own adequacy, competence, and distinctness. Such feelings often hinder achievement. The "baby" of the family, on the other hand, may opt to be just that; he may not strive and not try to develop simply because he doesn't have to. Other family members almost always give the youngest what he wants (especially in large families) and even in our folklore he often is pictured as most worthy. These suggestions are not, of course, necessary consequences, but it does seem evident that birth order is important in structuring interaction and expectations within the family and could well influence educability.

The self-concept of the child, developed largely out of his interaction with others and his perception of their evaluation of him, is highly significant for achievement. According to Sampson, the self-concept of the eldest child is based on the parent's appraisal of his behavior; he interacts with them more than do the other children and internalizes their norms and values.[91] The later children, however, derive their self-concepts and the standards of acceptable behavior from interactions with peers and if, as several sociologists have suggested, the cultures of parents and youngsters differ significantly in their evaluation of achievement in the classroom, we would expect to find eldest children more achievement-oriented than their siblings.

Two researchers have given a qualified "yes" to this hypothesis. Rosen, in an intensive study of boys ages 8-14 and their mothers, found the overall effects of ordinal position were not significant.[92] However, birth order was important when family size and social class were controlled. In the two lower classes, the oldest child had a lower achievement-motivation score than did the younger children, while in the three upper classes (which included the "standard" middle class) the achievement motivation of the oldest was highest. Since parents in the lower social classes are not highly achievement oriented themselves, the result is not surprising.

Most studies of achievement as we have previously noted, have included boys only. Corliss' study of over 3,000 fourth, fifth, and sixth graders in Michigan indicates that birth-order effects differ for boys and girls, and consequently generalizations from studies of males are very risky. Corliss found that for boys the oldest child in a family with other children scored highest on both achievement and intelligence tests. Next in rank were "middle" boys and lowest were only children and youngest children. For girls the picture was quite different. Girls who were only children scored highest, oldest girls were next, and middle and youngest children had lowest scores.[93]

Results quite different from these were obtained by Lees and Stewart.[94] They found, using the type of British secondary school attended as the measure of ability, that, among boys, only children and eldest children were most often chosen for highly valued schools and forms. Youngest boys were second most frequently chosen and intermediate children were last. Among girls, eldest children were selected more often.

Koch, studying ability only, obtained results which do not seem comparable to any of those reported above.[95] (It should be remembered that Koch dealt only with first graders and considered only two-child families.) He administered the Thurstone Primary Mental abilities test and found birth order a significant factor only on the perceptual speed test. Second-borns were more discriminating, and Koch suggests that this could be attributed to the fact that they must be alert to detail in order to defend their interests against the older, stronger siblings. Surprisingly, second-borns were also significantly higher in total score, which contradicts most other findings.

To further complicate the picture, Schoonover, studying sibling pairs in elementary schools, found no birth-order differences in either achievement or intellignece.[96] It is obvious that research in this area is not congruent, and that much additional work on achievement and intelligence differences is needed to clarify the relationships. Sex and age of subjects, and size of family need to be carefully controlled.

We have considered sex differences in educability in Part I, and have noted often that relationships which hold for one sex do not necessarily generalize to the other. These factors we will omit in our discussion of the sex structure of the family, and here we will simply summarize effects of sex of siblings. Sex role learning was found by Brim to differ according to sex of sibling:[97] cross-sex siblings were found to "possess more traits appropriate to the cross-sex role"[98] than were same-sex siblings. Since traits defined as masculine included aggressiveness, curiosity, ambition, and self-confidence, we would expect the achievement-orientation of girls (whose typical traits were described as uncooperativeness, obedience, and negativism) would be increased if a brother were present. Boys, on the other hand, might show less achievement behavior in the presence of a sister.

Results of both Schoonover and Koch support this hypothesis.[99] Both found that while males did not seem more intelligent or achieving themselves, children with male sibs consistently performed significantly better than did those with female sibs. Koch proposes an explanation somewhat different from that implied by Brim's work. She suggests that because boys are generally allowed and encouraged to be more active and aggressive, they are more stimulating to siblings and present a greater challenge.

Up to now we have talked of structural differences generated by children, and have assumed the presence of two parents. Many families lack one parent, usually the father, and we will conclude this section with a brief discussion of broken families.

Much has been said about the effects of family disruption on the personality of the child and on his propensity for delinquency, but the effects of this situation on his achievement have received almost no attention. Bossard and Boll mention briefly that the crisis of separation almost certainly hampers the intellectual development of the child. It is likely that he will remain disturbed for some time, and his school work surely suffers.[100]

Deutsch and Brown have given some attention to the influence of father absence on children's intelligence.[101] They found that among children from first to fifth grade, those in families without fathers had significantly lower IQ's than did those in intact families. This relationship holds within every socioeconomic status group, and they suggest that it is partially attributable to the preschool experience which often lacks organization and order in a fatherless home.

Two other studies have indicated that father absence often increases feminine identification, and this could well lead to lowered achievement-orientation.[102] Certainly more research is needed before definitive statements can be made.

In conclusion, it seems that consequences of family structure for educability can be stated only tentatively. As is the case with most sociological variables, the relationships to achievement and ability have not been adequately researched. Contradictions are rampant and in many areas evidence is almost nonexistent in any direction. There is certainly much room for well-formulated and carefully executed research in this area.

Section II

Influences of Social Class and Ethnicity on Educability

The Nature of Social Class

"Social Class" is one of the most familiar terms in sociology, and much effort has been devoted to conceptualizing and studying the stratification systems of communities and societies. Marx considered classes primarily economic; Weber distinguished between economic classes and statuses based on prestige. More recently sociologists have realized that there are many bases for differentiation within a community in American society: income, occupation, social prestige, social power, etc., and that an individual or family may occupy different positions within each hierarchy.[103] Most modern indices of total status use a combination of measures of several factors weighted and summed to give a total score. It should be realized, however, that such a score is an abstraction which may not fully correspond with reality, and that any grouping of such scores into classes is likely to be somewhat arbitrary.[104] Such a total score may have meaning in a small town where most people perceive a somewhat unidimensional hierarchy. However, in a large urban center, statuses of people in various institutional structures are much more distinct and separate, and forcing them into one system may be a great distortion of reality. Indeed, some segments of the population (e.g., certain ethnic groups) may be cut off from the major portion of the society that only ranking within them has any real meaning.

If, then, we cannot clearly delineate distinct, inclusive, and precisely defined classes on the basis of any particular factor or combination of factors, what meaning does stratification have for us? Do "social classes" have relevance for behavior; should we study them? The answer seems to be yes, and for several reasons. First, the fact that there is ranking is undeniable: people do differ in their possession of the things valued by society, be it money, education, prestige, or power. The amount of money or education that one has, while it may not completely determine his behavior or life chances, will certainly limit them. Secondly, people do recognize that such a ranking exists even though they may not be able to define it precisely and may not even agree on its characteristics. People act toward one another on the basis of their perceived position in society; hence, the response of others to a person is conditioned by that person's rank, and this in itself will cause his behavior to differ from those perceived to be of other ranks. Thirdly, people tend to associate intimately with others in life situations similar to their own, and since most of our basic values and life-orientations are developed out of these primary associations, we would expect people at different levels to have different attitudes.

Of course, in a society where ranking is not unidimensional people may differ in the system they define as most relevant, and, for example, they may choose to associate with well-educated people regardless of their income. This does not invalidate the

Importance of such selective groupings. In conclusion, all these factors (differential possessions, differential responses of others, and selective associations) tend to make for the emergence and existence of differing "styles of life" within the society. We may not be able to point to precise classes with distinct boundaries, but we can make generalizations about the behavior, the values, and the beliefs of people at various levels. Although not proven, this may be especially true of people at the very bottom of all hierarchies--those low in income, education, power, prestige and all other characteristics which the society in general defines as valuable. These people are not "chosen" by society on any basis, and they may interact intimately with each other and only with each other out of a common, rather complete deprivation. It is within such a group that we would be likely to find the most distinct life style, the most complete alienation from society, and, perhaps, if the basis of their exclusion from the rest of society is realized, the most desolation and least self-esteem. The ghetto societies of large cities and the rural Negroes of the South are indeed cut off from personal association with the rest of society, and it is here that we find cultural patterns and attitudes most different from the mainstream of society.

It should be evident that our purpose dictates that our primary interest will not be in differences in specific factors like income or occupation or in isolated behaviors but in the integrated behavior and value patterns of social classes--their total "style of life." Such things as occupation can be thought of as part of the life style and as quite influential determinants of it, but it is the total complex of behavior and values that will affect the child's educability. Actually, because of the difficulties inherent in defining class by income and the like, what we mean by "lower class" will be a group of people possessing a peculiar, differentiable life style. External characteristics are used in measuring social class because they are most efficient, easier to use, and because they generally seem to "work"--that is, people grouped in this way tend to differ in life style.

We have chosen to include the effects of race and ethnicity on educability in this section for several reasons. First, race is inextricably linked to social class in the United States and has always been a major determinant of class status. In fact, ethnicity can be thought of like income: it is another variable by which the position of people in the stratification system is determined. A second reason for considering race along with social class is that most studies dealing with race also deal with social class, and to try to separate the two aspects would not only prove difficult but would also necessitate a great deal of redundancy.

Perhaps a word should be said regarding terminology. While racial group and ethnic group are not synonomous, they are often used interchangeably for expediency. Since much of our concern will be with the Negro group, we may use race rather frequently. It should be understood, however, that Negroes are in no sense a single, homogeneous racial group (although often thought of as such), and that many scholars consider them to be an ethnic group with a distinct subculture.

We can begin by saying that the fact is established that lower-class children do less well on almost all measures of ability and achievement. This relationship holds regardless of the measure of class used. The intelligence quotient of children correlates highly with education of parents and father's occupation,[105] and the scores of children in lower socioeconomic status groups (where position is determined by combinations of educational, economic, and occupational factors) are significantly lower than the scores of higher-status children.[106]

Certain racial and ethnic groups also vary in achievement and in IQ scores. For example, Jewish boys are higher achievers than Italian boys,[107] and Negro children almost always perform less well than whites.[108] While these relationships are greatly reduced by controlling social class, they do not completely vanish. We shall be interested in isolating characteristics of the style of life or subculture of these groups which are independent of class standing.

To explain the differences listed above (and certainly to develop a program designed to minimize them), we shall need to know more about the peculiar life space of the children in each class and racial group. Although there has been discussion of differing life styles, we have little research to draw from in determining precisely what patterns and attitudes within this are most relevant for educability. The studies included, then, will be those which to the authors seem to deal with variables probably related to the child's intellectual development. Because of the length and the rather inclusive nature of this section, it will be subdivided into several subsections. The next division will deal primarily with class and ethnic value differences, and sections on child-rearing approaches, family organization, and specific characteristics of the children will follow in that order.

The Significance of Values

General statements about the peculiar constellation of traits associated with each class can be found in several sources.[109] We have spoken of the rather isolated situation of the very lowest status group (which, significantly, includes most Negroes), and Genevieve Knupfer's "Portrait of the Underdog" graphically supports this view.[110] They participate in fewer organized activities, even when available, than do "middle-class" citizens; they travel very little even when means to do so could be found; they read less and the materialsread is less "serious"; ar they know little about national or international affairs. If "middle-class values" are dominant in our society, these people would have little exposure to them even through impersonal sources.

Very great differences in values have been found to exist among social classes and ethnic groups, the most significant of which seem to be the complex "value orientations." Value orientations are, according to Rosen, "meaningful and affectively charged modes of organizing behavior--principles that guide human conduct."[111] The existence and significance of these broad general patterns was first extensively discussed by Kluckhohn,[112] and most recent studies have relied primarily on his categorizations of orientations.

Bernard Rosen relates achievement and social mobility to what he terms the achievement syndrome or achievement orientation. In a 1956 paper he listed two components of this syndrome: (1) Achievement Motivation and (2) Value Orientation.[113] In 1959 he added a third component, Educational and Occupational Aspirations.[114] Social classes and ethnic groups differ on all components and this, Rosen believes, accounts for a great deal of the variation in achievement and mobility striving among them. Our primary interest here is with the second component; the first and third parts of the syndrome will be discussed later.

Rosen finds that three value orientations are related to achievement orientation:

(1) The Activistic-Passivistic Orientation, or the extent to which the culture encourages the individual to believe in the possibility of manipulating the physical environment to his advantage;

(2) The Individualistic-Collectivistic Orientation, or the degree to which society expects the individual to subordinate his needs to those of the group (especially the family); and

(3) The Present-Future Orientation, which is described as the society's attitude toward time and which determines whether present sacrifices are perceived as worthwhile or obligatory.[115]

These values orientation are group characteristics, and Rosen has studied both class and ethnic groups in light of them.

In a study of adolescent males, Rosen found that those from the higher social classes tended to have an activistic, individualistic, future orientation, although this was less related to achievement than was achievement motivation.[116] In a 1959 study of 427 pairs of mothers and sons (aged 8-14) from six ethnic and racial groups in four Northeastern states, he hypothesized that Jews, White Protestants, and Greeks would be more individualistic, activistic, and future-oriented than would French-Canadians, Southern Italians, or Negroes.[117] The hypothesis was based on examination of the respective cultures: Judaism and Protestantism are individualistic religions; man in their view is not helpless but in fact morally bound to work toward improving his position. The Greeks are similar in their faith in individual effort and mastery. The parent cultures of the Southern Italians and French Canadians, on the other hand, stressed fate and taught that the individual has little control over his life. The kinship group was also quite strong in both, and the individual was expected to subordinate his will to it. Finally, the Negroes' experience in this country has not been conducive to internalization of achievement-oriented values, since planning and hard work have not generally been effective ways of overcoming prejudice and moving upward in the social structure.

Results were generally as expected. The instrument used consisted of seven items (e.g., that planning only makes a person unhappy since plans hardly ever work out anyway) on which disagreement indicated positive achievement values. Jewish mothers disagreed with 5.54 statements; White Protestants, with 5.16; Greeks, with 5.08; Negroes, with 5.03; Italians, with 4.17; and French-Canadians, with 3.68. The figure for Negroes is surprisingly high and not readily explainable. Social class was also determined for all respondents and, although it accounted for more of the variance than did ethnicity control on class, this did not eliminate its significance.

Strodtbeck's study of Jewish and Italian values yielded similar results with the exception that control on class nullified the significance of ethnic group variation.[118] Strodtbeck used an 8-item questionnaire very similar to Rosen's. Items used were those which had been found previously to discriminate significantly between under-and-over-achievers, and factor analysis of the items revealed three primary factors which Strodtbeck named Mastery, Organizational versus Individual Credit, and Deferred Gratification. The questionnaire was, unlike Rosen's, administered to fathers, and this could account for the different results. Social class was determined in both studies by measures of the father's occupation, education, etc., and it seems likely that an Italian father who had risen to high status would have had to accept the dominant achievement-oriented values. Mothers are, of course, much less influential in determining social status and could more easily hold traditional ethnic values even when classified as middle class on the basis of their husband's characteristics. It may well be as unrealistic to generalize from ethnicity about an upwardly mobile Italian male as it is to assume that a Ph.D. in the Peace Corps will exhibit typically lower-class traits because he earns less than $3,000 a year. Regardless of its implications for ethnicity, however, value orientations do seem to differ among social classes. Most important, Strodtbeck found that achievement-oriented values in fathers are highly significant for the actual achievement of their sons. Other less ambitious studies confirm the significance of attitudes obviously related to the broader value orientations. Battle and Rotter, whose subjects included both boys and girls from the sixth to the eighth grade, found that the degree to which the children accepted personal responsibility for what happened to them was significantly related to social class and race.[119] Both lower-class and Negro children were more likely to attribute responsibility to forces beyond their control.

Crandall and associates, working with children from first through third grades, confirmed the hypothesis that such an attitude is significantly related to achievement.[120]

Rosen's third component of achievement orientation, educational and occupational aspirations, also seems to vary with class and ethnicity. Rosen found quite interesting relationships between aspirations and ethnic group membership.[121] Percentages of mothers expecting sons to go to college were as follows: Jews - 96%; White Protestants - 88%; Greeks - 85%; Negroes - 83%; Italians - 64%; and French-Canadians - 56%. When asked about vocational aspirations, however, Negroes were *lowest*. Reconciliation of the differences between their educational occupational aspirations is difficult; perhaps the Negro educational system, which is still rather separate, makes a college education a more realistic goal than a good job. It is interesting that ethnicity accounted for *more* of the variance in occupational aspirations than did social class.

Bloom, Whiteman and Deutsch found in 1965 that Negro parents of first-and fifth-graders have both higher educational and higher occupational expectations for their children than do white parents.[122] The sample was chosen so that all social classes were equally represented in the white and Negro subgroups and this, plus the fact that Rosen's study antedated Bloom's by six years, could account for widely differing results. Also, Bloom questioned *both* parents regarding aspirations for both male and female children.

Although the effect of race aspirations is indeterminate, the effect of class seems quite clear. Most studies have found that level of aspirations increases with class position.[123] Type of job described also varies by class position: lower-class men consider the financial security (not necessarily high wages) offered by a job rather than its congeniality to the person, and they choose jobs with high monetary rewards regardless of their evaluation by society.[124]

Approach to Child Rearing and Social Class

Differences in achievement-oriented values of both parents and children and differences in aspirations of parents seem quite definitely related to the actual achievement of the child. The relationship of attitudes toward child rearing to the child's ability and achievement has not been determined, but differences by social class are so consistent that exclusion of child-rearing approaches from our discussion seems unjustified. Distinctions between developmental and traditional approaches were made in Part I, and it was there noted that the developmental approach is characteristic of the middle class while the traditional approach is favored by the lower class. Middle-class parents differ from lower-class parents in the qualities they value in children, and these different goals necessitate, as we shall mention later, different child-rearing practices. Middle-class parents desire a curious, dependable, self-controlled child who internalizes parental standards.[125] The lower-class child is expected only to be neat, quiet, and obedient, and to conform to external standards. These values are predictable given the activistic orientation of the middle class and the more passive view of the lower class; they also are congruent with differing class occupational experiences. Most middle-class jobs are not highly supervised and require self-reliance; most of these jobs also require work with people or ideas rather than with things. Middle-class parents are understandably more concerned with the internal dynamics of the child and with his attainment of self-control. Even within the lower class, men whose jobs lack close supervision and necessitate self-reliance usually have a developmental approach to child rearing.[126]

We noted above that the approach to child rearing was related not only to the values held by parents but also necessarily to their child rearing practices. Discipline seems especially affected, and class differences are shown in both punishment and the conditions under which the parent disciplines the child. Working-class parents are more likely to use ridicule, shouting, and physical punishment, while middle-class parents prefer reasoning, isolation, show of disappointment, and guilt-arousal.[127] Most of the middle-class techniques can be described as "love-oriented," and almost all engender internalization of parental values, a necessary requisite for self-control.[128]

Regarding conditions under which the child is punished, middle-class mothers are found by Kohn "to punish or refrain from punishing on the basis of their interpretation of the child's intent."[129] They are likely to be more lenient than lower class mothers toward wild or boisterous play but to be more harsh when they perceive that the child has lost self-control. Lower-class mothers, on the other hand, tend to punish children "when the immediate consequences of their sons' disobedient acts are most extreme, and to refrain from using punishment when its use might provoke even greater disturbance."[130] Hess and Shipman also stress the more individualized nature of middle-class control systems.[131] Demands based on the child's stuatus as "male" or "subordinate" are moderated by reference to internal states of both parent and child and to the specific situation. The relationship of these control systems to class language codes will be discussed in the following section.

While some generalizations with regard to discipline can be made with some assurance, the relative permissiveness or restrictiveness of the various social classes has been the object of controversy for several decades. Bronfenbrenner presents an excellent summary of research from 1930 to 1955, concluding that while the middle class was indeed more restrictive in the 1930's, it has recently surpassed the lower class in permissiveness, largely in response to "expert" demand.[132]

Race and Family Organization

We discussed in Part I and in Section I of Part II the effects of family disorganization and family power relations on the children. Since much has been made of the "unique" Negro family, a brief discussion of the problem seems warranted.

The Negro family does indeed suffer more from dissolution and disorganization; there are more Negro female heads of households due to divorce, death, and separation. Separation is especially common among Negroes: in 1960, 15.4% of the married nonwhite males and 20.1% of the married nonwhite females were living apart from their spouses. Comparable figures for whites were 4.0% and 4.5%.[133] Broken families are more common in the lower class than in the middle class, but the proportion of broken families is higher for Negroes within each status group than is proportion for whites.[134]

The proportion of married Negro males and females is consequently lower than the overall proportion for the population at large, and the percentage has dropped since 1950. This is especially true in rural areas, although the proportion of married whites is greater there than in the cities.

The power structure of the Negro family has been a hotly debated issue in recent years. Hilda Fortune presents a very competent summary of theoretical and empirical literature in the field.[135] She notes that Frazier has been the most quoted authority in the field.[136] His position, which has been generally accepted, is that the Negro family resembles a matriarchy. Slavery gave initial impetus to the situation by destroying the toal family system and giving the Negro woman sole responsibility for her children. Women were household servants and consequently had more prestige and access to white values than did the male field workers. The mother-centered Negro family has been reinforced in the past century by the more favorable economic situation of the Negro woman.[137] Since she has more often been able to find stable work, she has served as the economic support and household head of family. The male, if present, has been described as not firmly attached to the family and not seen as necessary nor dependable.

More recent literature gives us reason to believe, however, that the situation is changing, if indeed it ever existed in the extreme form described. Frazier has more recently noted that urbanization of the Negro family has brought with it a shift to the more equalitarian middle-class norm.[138] Research by Fortune indicates that there is no simnificant difference in power relations between white and Negro families, and that even in lower-class Negro families decision-making in all areas is rather equally shared by male and female heads.[139] A study by King of perception of family power structure by adolescents indicates that although syncratic power (sharing of decision-making by both parents) is more characteristic of white families, Negro families are less mother-dominated than they have been traditionally pictured.[140] Power is, of course, a very complex phenomenon, but it seems generally safe to say that both white and Negro families are moving toward a more equalitarian structure.

Class Differences in Achievement-Related Characteristics of the Children

We have primarily considered above differences in parental values or behavior related to the child's achievement, although children have been shown often to accept similar values. The last portion will focus on personality and adjustment characteristics of the child which show class variation and which are thought to be related to the child's achievement. We will consider in turn achievement motivation, self concept, and adjustment to school.

As mentioned above, Rosen posits achievement motivation as a prime requisite for an achievement orientation.[141] Basing his position on past research, Rosen states that achievement motivation is engendered by (1) independence training, or expecting self-reliance and granting autonomy in decision-making and (2) achievement training, or the setting of high goals which indicate high evaluation of achievement. Jewish, Protestant, and Greek children were high in achievement motivation as were most upper-class children, and their parents also favored early independence training. Negroes expected early self-reliance but did not set high goals for the child, and Negro children scored quite low on achievement motivation.

David McClelland's work supports the contention that some cultures are more likely to engender achievement motivation than others, and he also brings out the mutual influence of personality and culture.[142] Cultures in which need for achievement is high tend to experience rapid economic development since business-related occupations seem most congenial to people highly motivated to achieve.

Self-theory proposes that people work to maintain a consistent self-image, and "that feelings of inadequacy, insecurity, self-rejection, and the like would lower motivation, level of aspiration and actual performance."[143] Most research indicates that children who see themselves as inadequate and unable to succeed usually are low in achievement.[144] There seem to be class and racial differences in self-concept and, if so, this fact could add significantly to our understanding of the inferior achievement of lower-class and Negro children.

Most studies have dealt only with self-concept differences among Negro and white children, although Laird's results showed that middle-class eleven-year-old boys perceived themselves and the school more favorably than did lower-class boys.[145] A good deal orf research has supported the contention that Negro children have relatively weak self-concepts.[146] They become aware of color differences early and often prefer white dolls and wish to be white themselves, behaviors which evidence attitudes highly associated with low self-esteem.[147] Some quite recent research has indicated, however, that Negro children may have more adequate self-concepts than once believed.[148] Further investigation of this problem is certainly needed.

A final point to be made about the children themselves concerns their adjustment to school. It is immediately obvious that the middle-class child is probably better prepared for school. He has had more attention during his preschool years and has been encouraged to converse and to learn such things as colors, shapes, the alphabet, etc. He has been more places and has a wider variety of books, playthings, and other objects in his home, and this gives him a tremendous advantage in simple breadth of experience. By the time he reaches first grade he has usually attended kindergarten, and the transition to the new school pattern is not so terribly sharp.[149]

Sewell and Haller found that four factors indicative of poor adjustment were particularly related to social class.[150] Lower-class children were more concerned about their family's social status, they were more worried about their ability to succeed, and they showed more rejection of family and more nervous symptoms. Sewell and Haller believe that this maladjustment occurs because these children learn lower-class values in their preschool years and encounter the middle-class culture only upon reaching school. They are made to believe that middle-class values are superior, and this produces the tension manifested in the symptoms listed above.

Section 3

Language, Social Class, and Educability

The Relevance of Language and Social Class for the Development of Basic Verbal Skills

The preceding section has dealt primarily with the way social class membership affects the child's motivation to achieve. We have mentioned, however, that the cognitive ability of lower-class children is affected by their class membership, and some factors accounting for this have been discussed. Children in the lower class generally have a less stimulating environment: their experience is, for example, less varied--they have fewer objects to manipulate, fewer things to see, etc. There is evidence, however, that differential language development is one of the most important factors mediating the relationship between social class and cognitive ability, and for this reason we have chosen to devote a separate section to this topic. Research indicates not only that the language development of lower-class children takes place at a slower rate but also (and more importantly) that these children learn a language which is qualitively different from the language learned by middle-class children and used in the school.

It is almost unnecessary to state that competence in a language is a prerequisite for the most basic academic success. In a formal educational system, language is probably the most important means for the transmission of knowledge. The American neophyte does not silently watch his elders until he is ready for initiation into adult society--such a system is totally inadequate in a technologically complex society--and much of the culture must be transmitted by use of the written and spoken word. Deficient verbal development, however, may affect more than the child's ability to understand a presentation of facts: "ability to manipulate verbal symbol (sic) seems to play an important part in the process of thinking, and particularly in problem-solving."[151] Deaf children, who are severely limited in language development, often show retardation on both verbal and nonverbal tests of intelligence;[152] and bilinguals who never clearly develop one language also show inferior intelligence-test performance.[153]

The evidence that lower-class children are deficient in their knowledge and use of language is immense. Milner found that, for a group of first-grade children, the correlation of scores on a language factors test with socioeconomic status as determined by Warner's Index of Status Characteristics (ISC) was .86.[154] Schulman and Havighurst reported that scores of sixteen-year-olds on a vocabulary test correlated .46 + .08 with the ISC score.[155]

Early socialization experience affects language development, and the literature indicates that the amount of contact with adults is an important factor in the process. Twins, because much of their communication is with each other, develop at a slower rate and generally have lower IQ's than singly born children.[156] Milner found that reading ability and language competence at the first-grade level were significantly correlated with the amount of verbal interaction between parents and children.[157] A study by Bing yielded similar results; children whose parents talked with them, read to them, and tutored them had higher verbal IQ's than did children from homes where verbal stimulation was minimal.[158] Nisbet hypothesized that, because they have less verbal contact with adults, children from large families would suffer in verbal development and would score lower on verbal tests of intelligence.[159] Results, obtained from a sample of over 5,000 children in Aberdeen, Scotland, supported his hypothesis: family size was significantly negatively correlated with scores on both English and Verbal IQ tests. That the deficiency of the children from large families was indeed verbal was further indicated by the fact that the negative correlation of nonverbal IQ and family size was lower than that of verbal IQ and family size.

Since limited interaction between parent and child is a typical pattern in lower-class homes, this factor may well contribute to the observed verbal deficiency of these children. Wolf indicates that such "Environmental Process Characteristics" as the extent to which the child was given opportunities for enlarging his vocabulary and amount of assistance he was given in learning are positively related to intelligence.[160] Using a similar type of analysis, Baker extended the field of study to social class, and found that the scores of middle-class children on amount of contact with adults were much higher than those of children from lower-class environments.[161] It is, of course, true that lower-class families tend to be larger, and Nisbet's research supports the conclusion that the decreased interaction with adults would limit the child's verbal development and his ability to converse or perform on written exams.

The social class differences relevant for behavior are not likely to be strictly economic or occupational; distinctions most meaningful in behavioral analysis lie in the realm of values and norms. Recent research indicates that certain lower-class attitudes limit the amount and type of parent-child interaction viewed as desirable. In a study of child-rearing attitudes Radin and Kamii found that lower-class mothers agreed that children should not be encouraged to talk with parents about problems; they felt that a child so encouraged would make up imaginary problems to "pester" mothers.[162] These views also evidence the stringent demands placed on the lower-class mothers' time and the perceived need of the children for more verbal stimulation and aid in dealing with the environment. Milner, in eliciting the responses dealing with mealtime conversation, found that many lower-class mothers volunteered the opinion that children were to be passive and to "speak when spoken to." Parents often gave orders at this time, but children in turn were expected to respond only with perfunctory agreement.[163]

Discussion up to this point has centered only around the amount of interaction and verbal ability defined as linear variables which vary along a single continuum, e.g., as degree of understanding or extent of vocabulary. The more sophisticated theory and research in the field of social class and language development have suggested that there are class differences in the mode or type of language learned.

This view has been given its most explicit theoretical statement by the British sociologist Basil Bernstein.[164] He discovered that the IQ scores of working-class children were much lower on verbal than on nonverbal tests, and he also noted that classroom performance was related to the verbal score. He relates this limited verbal ability to a mode of speech which is entirely different from that of the middle class.

> It is suggested that the typical and dominant mode of speech of the middle class is one where speech becomes an object of special perceptual activity and one where a theoretical attitude is developed toward the structural possibilities of sentence organization. This speech mode is one where the structure and syntax are relatively difficult to predict for any one individual and where the formal possibilities of sentence organization are used to clarify meaning and make it explicit. This mode of speech will be called a formal language.
>
> By contrast, the speech mode of the lower working class may be distinguished by the rigidity of the syntax and the limited and restricted use of structural possibilities for sentence organization. Thus, these speech elements are highly predictable for any one speaker. It is a form of relatively condensed speech in which certain meanings are restricted and the possibility of their elaboration is reduced. Although any one content of this speech is not predictable, the class of the content, the structural organization, and syntax are highly predictable. This use of speech will be called a public language.[165]

The speech of a lower-class member, then, is not entirely predictable, but his range of choices for expression is limited, and for the group as a whole the range of choices is expressly set forth. The public language is not conducive to individual verbal expression; for its user, words cannot express a subjective state. The language is social: one chooses from the set range of socially given alternatives, and individualized expression can only be achieved by gestures or facial changes. Public language is stereotyped and non-specific; subjective intent is not verbally expressed. Because it is lacking in the precision needed for conceptualization and differentiation, the user is disposed toward descriptive rather than analytical concepts. Specific characteristics of the public language are:

1) Short, grammatically simple, often unfinished sentences with a poor syntactical form.
2) Simple and repetitive use of conjunctions (so, then, and because).
3) Little use of subordinate clauses to break down the initial categories of the dominant subject.
4) Inability to hold a formal subject through a speech sequence, thus facilitating a dislocated informational content.
5) Rigid and limited use of adjectives and adverbs.
6) Infrequent use of impersonal pronouns as subjects of conditional clauses or sentences, e.g., "one."
7) Frequent use of statements where the reason and the conclusion are confounded to produce a categoric utterance.
8) A large number of statements and phrases that signal a requirement for the previous speech sequence to be reinforced--"Wouldn't it," "You see," "Just fancy." This process is termed "sympathetic circularity."
9) Individual selection from a group of idiomatic sequences will frequently occur.
10) The individual qualification is implicit in the sentence organization: it is a language of implicit meaning.[166]

Certainly these modal differences in language have consequences for success in the educational system, and Bernstein suggests that the lower the social strata, the greater the resistance to formal learning. The language of the teacher and the language of the middle-class student are similar, and understanding presents no problem. The lower-class child, however, must translate the speech of the teacher into the public mode, and if this cannot be done the child simply does not understand. English is taught and spoken with the expectation that the child is aware of the modifying purpose of adverbs and adjectives and that he understands the possibilities of language for ordering and organizing experience. Certainly, too, mathematics and science require analytical ability; description is insufficient and the language performs a mediating function between theory (and the concepts in which it is counched) and direct experience. In conclusion, the middle-class child has been conditioned, by the nature of his language mode and by its usage by his parents, (1) to reflect (an ability certainly necessary for reading above the most basic level), (2) to discriminate finely, (3) to understand and use concepts, and (4) to view language as the primary tool for organizing and interpreting his experience. The disadvantage of the lower-class child is evident. Further relevance of Bernstein's language theory for school performance will be discussed later.

Bernstein's general theses that for the lower class "the cummulative deficiency in language functioning is the failure in development of an elaborated language system that has accurate grammatical order and logical modifiers, which is mediated through a grammatically complex sentence structure"[167] was tested by Deutsch.[168] Using a sample of 292 Negro and white first-and fifth-grade children, he measured conceptual ability, ability to abstract, vocabulary, grammar, and other relevant linguistic variables. The results lend firm support to Bernstein's theory. Deutsch found that Negro and lower-class children were very deficient in "measures which reflect abstract and categorical uses of language, as opposed to denotative and labeling usage,"[169] and concluded that "as the complexity of the levels increases, from labeling, through relating, to categorizing, the negative effects of social disadvantage are enhanced."[170] He also states that lower-class children not only have difficulty in communication with teachers but also develop awareness of their "grammatical ineptness" and are hesitant even to attempt to communicate.

The work of Leonard Schatzman and Anselm Strauss in the study of social-class modes of communication must also be mentioned.[171] Their research strikingly illustrates the lack of individualization, the inability to abstract, and the inability to carry through the discussion of one subject in a logical sequence characteristic of lower-class speech. Two groups of informants--one consisting of people with no higher than a grammar school education and an income of no more than $2,000 a year, the other, of people with some years of college and an income of $4,000 a year or more--were asked to give their own account of an Arkansas tornado. Lower-class respondents seemed insensitive to differences in individual experience: they described everything from their own perspective without regard for the fact that the listener had not been present and were unable to take the role of other persons describing situations from other points of view. They seldom used categories and seemed to think not in classes but in very concrete terms. They had, for example, little feel for the structure of the relief organizations operating at the time and could not think in organizational (or abstract) terms. Middle-class respondents, on the other hand, classified both action and people and viewed the relief organizations as "sets or classes of coordinated roles and actions."[172] Finally, lower-class informants not only could not consistently maintain a sequential narrative; they were also unable to make an understandable departure from it.

The most extensive research with young children based on Bernstein's formulations has been done by Robert Hess.[173] His research makes it clear that language is a determinant of the way a child learns to deal with his environment. The sample studied consisted of 160 Negro mothers and their children, and the thorough data-gathering procedure involved two home interviews plus observation and recording of an interaction session in which the mother taught the child three simple tasks. The language of the mothers was first analyzed, and middle-class mothers were especially high on amount of verbal output, mean sentence length, adverb range, syntactic structure elaboration, and abstraction. Hess uses the terms given by Bernstein in his most recent papers in distinguishing language modes and concludes that middle-class mothers were characterized by an elaborated (formal) code, while lower-class mothers used a restricted (public) one.

In one of the three interaction sessions observed the mother was required to teach the child how to sort a small number of toys. Hess notes that the task is not simply a game, since "the principle of grouping or classifying is basic to many learning situations and mental operations."[174] The teaching styles of the upper and lower social groups, which were widely divergent, clarify the disadvantage the lower-class child faces when he enters the school situation. The middle-class mother outlines the task; if the child is to group them by color, she tells him so. She then makes it clear that he is expected to perform the task and offers to give assistance if it is needed. Most lower-class mothers do not define the task; "the child is not provided with ideas or information that he can grasp in attempting to solve the problem; neither is he told what to expect even in general terms."[175] Lower-class mothers use nonverbal communication and may attempt to demonstrate the task, but the essential information the child needs is not given, and prodding only frustrates and inhibits the child. Hess and his colleagues see the consequences of this behavior as far-reaching--"as affecting both the cognitive ability of the child (in that he is not taught to deal with problems) and as affecting also the motivation for achievement and the sense of self-confidence because the experience is essentially frustrating."[176]

Results of the study also indicated that lower-class children were at age four already inferior in the verbal and intellectual skills necessary for school success; performance of middle-class children on the sorting tasks was better than that of lower-class children, and the middle-class children were better able to verbalize the principle of their sorts.

As stated above, however, these children are _not_ simply limited in basic cognitive ability--they are also lacking in motivation and confidence. Success in school is related to multitudinous factors, many of which are conditioned by social class. Language is a specific, identifiable force structuring the experience of its user, and its study hopefully will further refine the broad relationship between social class and intellectual ability. Only by identifying specific, clearly defined variables associated with social class can our predictions and explanations of behavior be made more precise. As the wages of the working class become more consonant with the salaries of the white-collar workers, economic classes will become less important. Variables more immediately relevant for behavior must be isolated, for it is all too obvious that economic or occupational position does not necessarily define attitudes or behavior patterns, and that identification with a certain style of life and normative system is a better predictor of behavior.

Language and Social Behavior

Bernstein sees language as social behavior, as the means for carrying on social interaction and expressing interpersonal relationships. It in turn serves to "shape and determine these relationships."[177] The structure of communication necessarily affects the structure of the social system within which it is used; it limits or extends the types of social relationships possible and, since one's view of himself is conditioned by his interaction with his significant others, it affects the individual's self-differentiation and evaluation. The theory is especially relevant for the study of the development and education of young children. It is during this period that the mode of language is determined: and the first important view of self and the world formulated.

The process of controlling and modifying the behavior of children is an important part of the socialization function of the family group, and the nature of the process is determined by the dynamic relationship of language and interaction. It has been noted in the previous section that the public, restrictive language is a social language; it does not (as does the formal, elaborative mode) encourage or permit individual qualification. The language "maximizes identifications with the aims and principles of the local group,"[178] while minimizing the expression of individual differences. It is literally an impersonal language, and "the factor of impersonality opens the way to a form of social behavior that is controlled by a rigid, explicit, authoritarian social structure, where status, role, age-grade, and the customary relations between these become strategic orienting cues."[179]

The language mode of a social class, then, corresponds to and precedes the orientation to behavior control. It is possible to distinguish between two polar types of families:[180] (1) status-oriented families, who control the behavior of a child by appeal to the ascribed role expectations of his status, and (2) person-oriented families, in which "the unique characteristics of the child modify status demands and are taken into account in interaction."[181] The middle-class language code, which is characterized by individual qualification and an elaboration of subjective intent and feeling, creates an atmosphere in which the subjective motivation and unique qualities of the child are important. In the lower-class family, however, the ascribed status of the child (e.g. "seven-year-old" or "boy") supplies the basis for behavioral expectations, and control is applied to elicit conformity to these expectations. Furthermore, compliance from the child is demanded strictly on the basis of the parent's authority as parent or elder.

The differences in orientation toward control make for differences in the type of compliance required. Because the public language prohibits reflection and the control orientation makes no allowance for peculiar individual or situational factors, an immediate, conditioned response is demanded of the child. The child is not asked to reflect or discriminate but to obey.

Three major consequences follow these premises. First, the method of control differs. Since immediate response is required of the lower-class child and superior status is the sufficient basis of parental authority, reasoning is not available as a form of control. Words cannot serve as an instrument of mediation between feelings of displeasure in the parent and their expression, and physical coercion, shouting, etc. may be the only means of control available. "Reasons" supplied in answer to any questioning of demands are often not reasons at all in the formal sense; they are simply statements reaffirming the authority of the parent (e.g., "Because I'm your father"). The middle-class parent, on the other hand, because he is able to specify the nature and cause of his displeasure, can "reason" with the child and attempt to control his behavior through verbal means.

The second consequence of the differing control orientations concerns the situations in which control is applied and the evaluation of the undesirable. The middle-class parent, because he views the child and situation individually, is sensitive to the child's intent in the performance of an act and to his subjective state, and he punishes the child according to his evaluation of this intent. The lower-class parent, however, is able to respond only to the immediately given and cannot fathom the complex relationship between intent and action. He consequently punishes according to the consequences of the child's act.

Finally, control-orientation affects both the goals of the parents in their exercise of control and the self-regulative dimension of the child's personality. The differentiating and individualistic elaborative formal mode heightens the child's awareness of his own motivation and of the affective states and motivations of others. Bernstein suggests that this lowers the "guilt-threshold," and makes it possible to control behavior by inducing guilt. The parent, if displeased, can verbally convey his affective state and give reasons for his displeasure, and the child subsequently modifies his behavior because guilt is induced. He feels personal involvement in the wrong-doing, and this is the prerequisite for the primary goal of the middle class parent-self-control. The goal of control in the lower class, however, can only be conformance to externally imposed standards; the standards are not internalized and guilt is not coincident with wrong doing.

The language mode and attendant control systems affect several other personality characteristics which Bernstein considers relevant for school performance. Because the public mode and control methods demand immediate, impulsive action and inhibit reflection and organization, the lower-class child learns to value immediate gratification and is unable to respond to long-term goals. The world of the middle-class child, however, is well organized and rationally structured; he can see the relation of his current experience to the future. Rewards are stable and predictable, and the child believes in the efficacy of distant goals because short-term predictions are upheld.

The stability and predictability of the middle-class child's environment and the heightened guilt and personal involvement induced by verbal control systems also tend to cause the child to feel that he can actively manipulate his environment and control success and failure. Because the exercise of authority in the lower-class home is likely to be more arbitrary and personal involvement in action is lacking, the child tends to be passive and to blame the environment or chance for his failure.

Systems of control and the traits they foster have implications for the child's general intellectual development. Practices which recognize his individuality reinforce his ability to differentiate and verbalize his subjective experience, and this leads to greater ability to "differentiate and conceptualize objects in his environment."[182] When language organizes the relationship between sense experience and the conceptions of the child about it, learning may be on a higher or more abstract level. Notions of causality are also enhanced by middle-class experience, since the idea that the present is relevant for the future implies a causal relationship. Furthermore, the control system of the middle-class demands reflection on the part of the child, while this lower-class system demanding an immediate restricted response, "develops modes for dealing with stimuli which are impulsive rather than reflective, which deal with the immediate rather than the future, and which are disconnected rather than sequential."[183]

The formal educational system places a further disadvantage on the lower-class child. First of all, it is by nature an institution in which the present is closely linked to the distant future, and the child whose time span of anticipation is short will have difficulty understanding its relevance for him. Both the lower-class child and his parents find the formal organizational nature of the school hard to grasp. Adults see the school as a confusing, impersonal institution over which they have no control, and their children are distressed by the nonaffective and impersonal response of the teacher. The public language does not enhance verbalization of individual differences, but lower-class relationships are close, emotionally charged, and consequently personal in the common sense of the word.

The classroom also proves to be a place of strange values and expectations. No first-grade child finds adjustment to the new situation easy, but the very short attention span of the lower-class child adds to the difficulty. Individual differences are stressed in the school, and the child often sees as a threat to himself the necessity for individual articulation of feeling and acceptance of individual responsibility. The values of the teachers also conflict with those of the child. The teacher neither understands nor sees as acceptable the nonverbal, expressive aspect of the public language, and he may view the child as rude and aggressive. Recognition of a superior-inferior relationship soon comes to the lower-class child, and this plus the academic failure he experiences leadst to personal devaluation. The proposition that a positive self-concept is necessary for adequate learning has been firmly supported by research.

Theory is not so much right or wrong as useful or useless, and its worth can best be determined by answering two questions: (1) Does it generate empirically testable hypotheses or useful "theories of the middle range?" and (2) Are logically derived propositions and hypotheses upheld by empirical evidence?

Bernstein's theory does provide some clarification of the problems discussed regarding the studies of control presented earlier. Some of the confusion probably derives from the fact that amount of control exerted over the child's behavior may not be the most relevant variable. Bernstein's theory would indicate that the status or person orientation of the family, since it influences the goals and the methods of control, is a more powerful determinant of school performance and of traits like achievement motivation and ability to respond to distant goals which affect it. Results may have been confounded by the fact the extent of control provided by parents does not produce similar effects on groups whose language mode is very different. Furthermore, a difference in the effects on boys and girls would be expected if the family is oriented toward control by status.

The effect of amount of control may be determinable, then, only when orientation is held constant, and it would be interesting to see whether studies proceeding along this line give more consistent results.

The usefulness of Bernstein's theory can be evaluated by looking for studies which have couched research in a frame of reference suggested by the theory and have tested hypotheses derived from it. Much of the research discussed in Part I and in Section 2 of this part is obviously related to Bernstein's work and generally tends to support his conclusions. Research by Duvall and John on developmental and traditionally oriented families supports the hypothesis that middle-class parents respond more often to the subjective intent of the individual child; Strodtbeck and Rosen confirm Bernstein's postulation of differing time orientations; and Aronfreed has noted that middle-class children are more likely to take responsibility for their actions.

Hess's studies have developed hypotheses derived from the language-based theory, and his results also support the relevance of many of Bernstein's distinctions. Whether the status vs. person orientation of families is a valid distinction which influences the mother's behavior was tested by asking what they would do if their child broke school rules or "misbehaved" in class. Answers of middle-class mothers focused on the child, not on the infraction. They tended to support the child and to say that they would find out from the child why he acted as he did.

The child was not seen as a being of inferior status who must on this basis conform to all rules. Lower-class parents, on the other hand, gave status oriented responses: the child's disobedience was viewed a priori as inadmissable, and mothers were prepared to support the authority figure by punishing the child. Hess concludes that such behavior is not likely to help the child in learning to deal with the world; he only learns to accept it as inscrutable and arbitrary. Status-oriented and person-oriented mothers could also be distinguished by their responses to the question: "Imagine your child is old enough to go to public school for the first time. How would you prepare him? What would you tell him?"[184] Person-oriented mothers presented the school positively as a place for learning and described the teacher as a friendly figure who would be willing to help the child with problems and questions. The lower-class parents often gave no specific information about the school and told the child that it was a place where he was to behave and obey the teacher. Learning was not emphasized; the child was only told that he was to play a "passive and compliant role."[185]

In short, Bernstein's theory seems well able to both integrate and generate research. It is hoped that work in the future will continue to test, modify, and extend his theory, and in so doing add significantly to our knowledge of the way in which the mutually influencing variables of language and interaction affect the cognitive development of the child.

Part III

EXTRA FAMILIAL INFLUENCES ON THE ABILITY AND ACHIEVEMENT OF CHILDREN

Section 1

Learning and the Mass Media

Although most of the young child's experience is within the family, the proliferation of the mass media in recent years has made it impossible to neglect this important extrafamilial influence in any study of child development. Since the advent and general acceptance of television, a visual medium accessible to the youngest child, much of the research in the area of mass communication has been focused on children and the effects of television on them.

It has been generally recognized that any attempt to determine *the* effects of mass media on children or adults is futile; a human being is not a passive receptor and both his uses of the media and their effect on him will be mediated by his individual characteristics. It is an accepted and well-documented sociological premise that among the most important of these characteristics are the groups of which the person is a member and those which serve a reference function for him. Sociological research on the general problem of information flow has shown that ideas and information from the mass media are first accepted by opinion leaders in a group and flow from them to other members.[186] Even more important for our study of the young child is the fact that a person's primary group--his family and close peer groups--exert pressure toward conformity with their norms. In this capacity they are likely to influence media use, media preferences, and the individual's perception and evaluation of material presented. We must, then, be careful of general statements about children's use of media or the effects on children and discuss such problems only in the context of their interaction with individual characteristics such as mental ability, with values and motivation which are largely group determined, and with the child's integration into parent and peer groups.

Our primary interest is, of course, the relationship of media use to learning and school achievement. If, however, we find significant effects, a discussion of patterns of media use will be helpful for determining the numbers and types of children affected.

As we have stated before, television is, for children, by far the most important and time-consuming of the mass media. It is present in the home and requires a minimum of intellectual effort and most children begin to view television at age two. By age three, a child probably already has favorite programs.[187] Generally (although there are many individual differences which will be discussed later) the average three-year-old watches 45 minutes per week-day, and the five-year-old, about 2 hours. Time per day gradually rises to a high of slightly over three hours a day somewhere between the fifth and eighth grade. After this it declines gradually.[188] This age pattern is closely paralleled by movie use, and by reading of books and comic books. Radio listening and magazine and newspaper reading tend to increase throughout the school years.[189]

Age is not, however, the only important variable in determining amount of use or type of material chosen. Mental ability has been found by both Schramm and Himmelweit to be on the whole inversely correlated with television use. Schramm found, however, important differences with age. Bright children under ten tend to use all media more than do other children: they read more books, see more movies, and watch television as much if not more than duller children.[190] By the sixth grade, however, the percentage of high IQ children in the heavy viewing group has decreased, and by the tenth grade the percentage of light viewers among children of high mental ability is almost twice as great as the same percentage among children of low ability.[191]

Schramm also found differences in preferred type of content according to mental ability. Working from the hypothesis that most television content is fantasy-oriented while print (newspapers, books, and magazines) is more realistically oriented, he divided the children into four groups: 1) a "fantasy group" consisting of high users of television and low users of print, 2) a "reality group" consisting of high users of print and low users of television, 3) a "low users group" consisting of children low in use of both media and 4) a "high users group" consisting of high users of both television and print. At all age levels a significantly larger proportion of high-ability children were in the reality group, and differences increased with age.[192]

More interesting from a sociological standpoint is the fact that Schramm found reality and fantasy orientations related to social class membership and with acceptance of certain social norms. Lower class children were at all age levels more likely to be fantasy users than were middle class children. Schramm also questioned children on future time orientation and acceptance of deferred gratification and found that reality users were more likely to hold to the typically middle-class norms of activity and self-betterment and to be oriented towards the future.[193] While most of the media behavior of very young children is fantasy oriented, middle-class children feel pressure with advancing age to comply with reality-oriented adults in their social group. In the lower class, however, less change is required to bring about congruence with adult norms.

Parent and peer group orientation and integration probably explain even more of the individual variation in media use and preference. Himmelweit found that children's viewing behavior closely parralleled that of their parents,[194] and Rush states that parent and peer group encouragement is the most important variable in determining how much the child views television.[195] The specific relationship of the child to his primary groups has also been found to affect media behavior. Riley and Riley found that young children who belonged to a peer group and could communicate easily with friends were less likely to express interest in stories or programs which "foster fantasies of aggression or escape."[196] Communication with parents also affected media preferences; among adolescent boys they found that a significantly higher percentage of boys in close communication with parents liked to read or listen to news.[197] The situation becomes more complicated when the child's *reference* group (the group from which he derives his values) is considered. Among both boys and girls, those using the peer group rather than the family as a major reference group were *more* likely to prefer programs dealing with action and violence.[198] The investigators attribute this finding to the fact that peer-oriented children see themselves as falling short of parental expectations and turn to fantasy to escape the strain. They also found that even among children in close communication with parents, those who selected peers as a reference group were *less* disposed to read or listen to newscasts than were comparable parent-oriented children.[199]

Other studies support these findings. Eleanor Maccoby found that middle-class children who were subject to many restrictions and not treated warmly spent more time watching television than those in more permissive environments.[200] According to Schramm, children who experienced conflict with parents (measured by extent to which parental aspirations for child were higher than child's own aspirations) watched more television, listened to more radio, saw more movies, and read fewer books and magazines than children who experienced no such conflict. Conflict with peers also affected media behavior. Children who had conflict with either parent or peers were somewhat more likely to be fantasy-oriented than were children without any conflict, while children high in both parent and peer conflict were twice as likely as the no-conflict group to be fantasy users.[201]

Turning now to the cognitive effects of mass media, and especially of television, it should first be noted that most studies have found that television viewing has no significant effect on a child's grades.[202] Himmelweit's results were essentially similar, although she found that bright children who were viewers were likely to fall behind comparable children who did not have access to television.

Studies on learning from televison are slightly ambiguous, but the general consensus seems to be that television is helpful for the very young child and that learning from television is incidental rather than purposeful. Both Schramm and Himmelweit agree that only the young benefited cognitively from television, and Schramm suggests several reasons for this.[203] Television is new for the young child and therefore holds his very close attention. Brodbeck found that a "Hopalong Cassidy" film which produced considerable learning in younger children was relatively ineffective with older ones, primarily because they were familiar with the type of material and were no longer particularly attentive.[204] Another reason given by Schramn for the effectiveness of television on young children is the fact that they view television experiences as real, and learning is more likely to take place when this is so.

Both Schramm and Evans concluded that television's greatest influence was on the vocabulary of preschoolers.[205] Schramm found in comparing two towns in Canada, one with and one without television, that television increased the general vocabulary of first-graders of high and low intelligence but had little effect on children of average IQ. Comparison of heavy and light viewers in the town with television, however, showed that heavy viewers who were bright or average scored higher than light viewers on a general vocabulary test, but that there was little difference between heavy and light viewers in the low IQ group.

With older children the situation is somewhat different. Sixth-grade children in the Canadian town without television did consistently better in tests of general knowledge than did children in the television town. Comparisons of heavy and light viewers among older children indicated that while heavy viewers were better able to name singers and band leaders, light viewers were better acquainted with statesmen and writers.[206]

Although most researchers agree that television has not demonstrably increased the passivity of children, there is little evidence that it is truly sparking creativity. Schramm notes that television may stimulate interest or develop existing interests, but that it rarely motivates the child to create.[207]

Much emphasis has been placed by Schramm and others on the fantasy aspect of television, and Maccoby postulates that the availability of what she calls "externally-controlled fantasy" may be decreasing the more creative fantasy of children in active play.[208]

Both researchers and the community at large have been plagued in recent years by the question of how violence in movies, television, and other media affects children. Speculation on the subject has abounded, some writers insisting that aggression is increased; others, that it is decreased due to vicarious expression. Several experimental studies have indicated that viewing violence heightens aggression, and there is some evidence that techniques are learned even when the violence portrayed is unsuccessful.[209]

The effectiveness of mass media in teaching anything from vocabulary to violence can be viewed as a problem of their effectiveness as instruments of socialization. Previously discussed research by Riley and Riley indicates that programs of violence are more often preferred by nonmembers of peer groups, and it could be postulated that these programs would have a significant socializing effect since peer group norms are not competing.

A study by Gerson reinforces the position that integration into peer culture affects the effectiveness of the mass media as a socializer, and indicates the importance of race and class variables as well.[210] Although the study dealt with the norm-acquiring and norm-reinforcing functions of mass media for adolescent dating behavior, the results are of interest in revealing the potentialities of this approach. Gerson found that more media socialization occurs among lower-class adolescents than among members of the middle class. The effects of peer integration varied with race. For whites, those most involved in the peer culture were the ones most likely to be media socializees, presumably because the media are directed toward them. Among Negroes, however, media socialization varied inversely with integration into peer culture.

This approach could well be used with younger children to determine more specifically the interaction of group memberships (both in primary and larger social groupings) and learning from mass media. Future research could profitably be oriented in this direction.

Section 2

Peer Groups and the School Environment

Although peer groups and their function in the educational context have been studied extensively among adolescents, research in this area in the preschool and elementary setting is quite meager. Sociological research on the subject is almost nonexistent; indeed, one would think, judging from the literature, that the child has no meaningful contact with children outside the family before age 12. This is manifestly not the case, however, and to omit the topic from a review such as this would serve only to further an unfortunate trend. Given the importance which George Herbert Mead attached to play and games with other children for the development of self and the learning of social roles, sociological neglect of young children's peer groups is difficult to understand.

Bossard and Boll do devote an entire chapter of their book to the preschool peer group, but their treatment rarely goes beyond the purely descriptive level.[211] Considering the general dearth of material on the subject, however, their discussion cannot be neglected. Furthermore, some interesting hypotheses are formulated if not thoroughly tested.

Bossard and Boll state that while the very young child tends to play individually, by the age of three or four the child prefers to play with other children. After this time the peer group becomes an increasingly dominant part of the child's life, and an effective agent in socialization. The peer group serves in many ways to direct and channel the child's development, and three of the most important of these are specifically enumerated by Bossard and Boll. The peer group first aids the child in learning to recognize the rights of others.[212] This is almost synonomous with the learning of societal roles and is certainly necessary for effective participation in society. This can probably only be learned in contact with equals, since here explicit rules must evolve and behavior cannot be controlled (as it is in the family) authoritatively and without the notion of reciprocal rights and duties. Certainly this is necessary for adaptation to any school setting other than a totally autocratic one in which child-child interaction is prohibited, and teacher-child interaction, restrictive.

The peer group also stringently regulates the behavior of its members and in this capacity is an agency of control for the larger group (e.g., the school or community). If this were not the case in the school, the range of individual behavior could be so wide that most of the energy of the teacher would be expended on control. It should be emphasized, however, that peer-group control functions positively for the larger organization only so long as peer norms are congruent with the general norms. This is often not the case, and studies of adolescents demonstrate that school norms can be overshadowed and often opposed by the peer culture.[213] Although peer culture in the very early years usually takes parental values as its basis, the presence of several ethnic, occupational, or educational groups in a neighborhood can provide impetus to diversification, especially when the children's play groups are mixed.

The peer group also functions to give the child a sense of security. Especially in an urban environment which is often diversified and impersonal, the child receives a necessary sense of safety and belonging from peer group interaction.

Bossard and Boll concluded from a study of 50 case records of adults concerning preschool play groups that both the makeup and the activities of the preschool group affect the child's ability to make the transition to the school environment.[214] Children whose play group had included several other children of equal age and of both sexes made the transition easily. Those who had played only with older or younger children found it difficult to establish a relation of equality with classmates, however, and those whose play groups were composed only of same-sex children found relations with the opposite sex difficult. The study also indicated that children even at this age develop a culture which affects adjustment to school, since subjects noted that the activities and values of the preschool peer group affected preparation for and interest in school learning.

A study by Stendler indicates that the peers and older children also influence the child's expectations about school.[215] She found that types of learning expected by children are quite different from mother's perceptions of what the child will learn.

While parents see the school as emphasizing discipline and social adjustment, children expect to concentrate on reading and writing and to spend much time in creative activities.

It was mentioned above that the culture of the peer group structures the child's attitude toward the school and toward learning in general. The prestige of academic achievement and its consequent desirability among students is determined by the students themselves. Brookover notes that while academic accomplishment merits high prestige when children enter the elementary school, its relative advantage declines throughout the primary and secondary school, rising again only at the college level.[216] Of course, what Brookover calls the "school climate" varies greatly from school to school and the culture of different cliques within one school may be quite different. Although the question has not been researched, distinct groups with markedly different subcultures (such as Clark's "academic," "fun," and "delinquent" subcultures[217]) are probably more prevalent in high school than in the elementary grades, since young children are more vulnerable to teachers' expectations.[218]

Social class differences in children's prestige values have been found, however, among twelve-year-olds, and it is possible that such differences exist in earlier grades. Pope found from a cluster analysis of children's answers to a reputational test that while children of high social class recognized a separate cluster of traits dealing with classroom adjustment and assurance with adults, no such cluster could be found among children of lower status.[219] Pope notes that assurance with adults is related to aggressiveness among lower class children and probably connotes resistance to adults. This indicates lack of recognition or acceptance of an adequate means of relating to the teacher in a classroom setting. This situation could well inhibit learning, and it would be interesting to determine whether this situation exists in the early grades. If it does not, one might conclude that this resistance is at least partially school fostered rather than being induced by the lower-class culture itself.

Up to this point we have discussed primarily the effects of peer group values on attitudes toward learning. It is not possible to conclude, however, without mentioning the possibility that peers can be effective teachers of academic material themselves. Piaget certainly recognized the fruitfulness of peer interaction in reducing the child's egocentrism and in fostering the development of concepts necessary for operational thought. The new informal schools which are becoming prevalent in Britain seem to be taking excellent advantage of the ability of children to teach each other, and their "family" grouping system seems to be a quite effective way of enabling younger children to learn from older students.[220]

In summary, this short review indicates that the neglect of peer groups among young children is indeed unfortunate. Peers have, from a very early age, a strong influence both on children's attitudes toward learning and on the learning process itself. Sociologists would do well to concentrate considerable attention on this aspect of education in the future.

REFERENCES PART I

Section 1 - Parent Attitudes and Achievement

[1] See, e.g., J. Block, "Personality Characteristics Associated with Fathers' Attitudes toward Child-rearing," *Child Development*, XXVI (1955), pp. 41-48, and V. Crandall and Anne Preston "Verbally Expressed Needs and Overt Maternal Behaviors," *Child Development*, XXXII, (1961), pp. 261-70.

[2] W. Katovsky, Anne Preston, and V. J. Crandall, "Parents' Achievement Attitudes and their Behavior with their Children in Achievement Situations," *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, CIV (1964), pp. 105-21.

[3] V. Crandall, et al., "Parents' Attitudes and Behaviors and Grade-school Children's Academic Achievement," *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, CIV (1964), pp. 53-66.

[4] H. A. Moss and J. Kagan, "Maternal Influences on Early IQ Scores," *Psychological Reports*, IV (1958), pp. 655-61.

[5] J. E. Biglin, "The Relationship of Parental Attitudes to Children's Academic and Social Performance," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1964).

[6] Elizabeth M. Drews and J. E. Teahan, "Parental Attitudes and Academic Achievement," *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, XIII (1957), pp. 328-32.

[7] June E. Chance, "Independence Training and First Graders' Achievement," *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, XXV (1961), pp. 149-54.

[8] Marian Winterbottom, "The Relation of Need for Achievement in Learning Experiences in Independence and Mastery," in J. Atkinson (ed.), *Motives in Fantasy and Society* (Princeton, N. J.: Van Nostrand, 1958) pp. 453-78.

[9] E.g., David McClelland, et al., *The Achievement Motive* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1953), and Bernard C. Rosen, "The Achievement Syndrome: A Psycho-Cultural Dimension of Social Stratification," *American Sociological Review*, XXI (1956), pp. 203-11.

[10] Evelyn M. DuVall, "Conceptions of Parenthood," *American Journal of Sociology*, XII (1949), pp. 193-203.

[11] Some examples of Kohn's work in this area are "Social Class and the Exercise of Parental Authority," *American Sociological Review*, XXIV (1959), pp. 352-66; "Social Class and Parental Values," *American Journal of Sociology*, LXIV (1959), pp. 337-51; and "Social Class and the Parent-child Relationship: an Interpretation," *American Journal of Sociology*, LXVIII (1963), pp. 471-80.

[12] A. D'Heurle, Jeanne Mellinger, and E. Haggard, "Personality, Intellectual, and Achievement Patterns in Young Children," *Psychological Monographs*, LXXIII (1959), Whole No. 483.

[13] J. W. B. Douglas, *The Home and the School: A Study of Ability and Attainment in the Primary School* (London: MacGibbon and Kee, 1964), Chapter VII.

[14] Ibid., Chapter III.

[15] Ibid., pp. 21-22.

[16] B. C. Rosen and R. D'Andrade, "The Psychosocial Origins of Achievement Motivation," *Sociometry*, XXII (1959), pp. 195-218.

[17] Ravindrakumar H. Dave, "The Identification of Environmental Process Variables that are Related to Educational Achievement," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1963).

[18] R. M. Wolf, "The Identification and Measurement of Environmental Process Variables Related to Intelligence," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1964).

[19] F. Strodtbeck, "Family Interaction, Values and Achievement," in D. C. McClelland, *et al.* (eds.), *Talent and Society* (Princeton, N. J.: Van Nostrand, 1958), pp. 135-194.

[20] B. Rosen, "Race, Ethnicity, and the Achievement Syndrome," *American Sociological Review*, XXIV (1959), pp. 47-60.

[21] See, e.g., Robert R. Bell, "Lower Class Negro Mothers' Aspirations for their Children," *Social Forces*, XVIII (1965), pp. 493-500, and Bernard C. Rosen, "The Achievement Syndrome," pp. 203-211.

Section 2 - The Influence of Parental Sex Roles

[22] Talcott Parsons, "The American Family: Its Relations to Personality and to the Social Structure," in Talcott Parsons and R. F. Bales (eds.), *Family, Socialization, and Interaction Process* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1955, pp. 3-34. See also O. G. Brim, Jr., "The Parent-Child Relationship as a Social System: Parent and Child Roles," *Child Development*, XXVIII (1957), pp. 343-64.

[23] See R. F. Bales and Phil E. Slater, "Role Differentiation in Small Decision Making Groups," in Parsons and Bales, op. cit., pp. 259-306.

[24] Talcott Parsons, "The Organization of Personality as a System of Action," in Parsons and Bales, op. cit., p. 163.

[25] James H. S. Bossard and Eleanor Stoker Boll, *The Sociology of Child Development* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960), pp. 315-25.

[26] Ibid., p. 331-32. See also Ruth J. Tasch, "The Role of the Father in the Family," *Journal of Experimental Education*, XX (1962), pp. 319-61.

[27] Bossard and Boll, op. cit., pp. 327-28.

[28] Ibid., pp. 342-43.

[29] Andrew Henry, "Sibling Structure and the Perception of the Disciplinary Roles of Parents," *Sociometry*, XX (1957), pp. 67-74.

[30] Lois W. Hoffman, "The Father's Role in the Family and the Child's Peer-Group Adjustment," *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, VII (1961), pp. 97-105.

[31] Urie Bronfenbrenner, "The Changing American Child - A Speculative Analysis," *Journal of Social Issues*, XVII, No. 1 (1961), pp. 6-18.

[32] Hoffman, op. cit., pp. 97-105.

[33] V. Crandall, *et al.*, "Parents' Attitudes and Behaviors and Grade-School Children's Academic Achievement," *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, CIV (1964), pp. 53-66.

[34] See Lois W. Hoffman, "Parental Power Ralations and the Division of Household Tasks," Marriage and Family Living, XXII (1960) pp. 27-35; D. M. Heer, "Dominance and the Working Wife," Social Forces, XXXVI (1958), pp. 341-47; and R. O. Bolld, Jr., "The Husband-Wife Relationship," in F. Ivan Nye and Lois W. Hoffman, (eds.), The Employed Mother in America (Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1963), pp. 282-305.

[35] Lois W. Hoffman, "Mother's Enjoyment of Work and Effects on the Child," Child Development, XXXII (1961), pp. 187-97.

[36] Lee G. Burchinal, "Personality Characteristics of Children," in Nye and Hoffman, op. cit., pp. 106-121.

[37] Francena L. Nolan, "Effects on Rural Children," in Nye and Hoffman, op. cit., pp. 122-24.

[38] M. M. Kostick, "A Study of Transfer; Sex Differences in the Reasoning Process," Journal of Educational Psychology, XLV (1954), pp. 449-58.

[39] See G. A. Milton, "Five Studies of the Relation Between Sex Role Identification and Achievement in Problem Solving." Department of Industrial Administration, Department of Psychology, Yale University, Techinical Report No. 3, 1958.

[40] See, e.g., J. Kagan, "Acquisition and Significance; of Sex Typing and Sex Role Identity," in M. L. Hoffman and Lois W. Hoffman, Review of Child Development Research, Vol. 1, pp. 137-67 (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964).

[41] O. G. Brim, "Family Structure and Sex Role Learning by Children," Sociometry, XXI (1958), pp. 1-16.

[42] R. E. Hartley, "Sex-Role Pressures and the Socialization of the Male Child," Psychological Reports, V (1959), pp. 457-68.

[43] Kagan, op. cit., p. 158.

Section 3 - Parental Behavior and Achievement

[44] Ravindrakumar H. Dave, "The Identifucation of Environmental Process Variables that are Related to Educational Achievement (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1963).

[45] R. M. Wolf, "The Identification and Measurement of Environmental Process Variables Related to Intelligence," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1964).

[46] A. L. Baldwin, "Socialization and the Parent-Child Relationship,: Child Development, XIX (1948), pp. 133-34.

[47] Ibid., pp. 127-36, and A. L. Baldwin, "The Effect of Home Environment on Nursery School Behavior " Child Development, XX (1949), pp. 49-61.

[48] E. A. Milner, "A Study of the Relationships Between Reading Readiness in Grade One School Children and Patterns of Parent-Child Interactions," Child Development, XXII (1951), pp. 95-112.

[49] Georgianne Baker, "Patterning of Home Resources for Children's Early Cognitive Growth," (unpublished paper, Michigan State University, 1965).

[50] Ibid., p. 9.

[51] Ibid., p. 9.

[52] Ibid., p. 17.

[53] E. Bing, "Effect of Childrearing Practices on Development of Differential Cognitive Abilities," Child Developmen XXXLV (1963), pp. 631-48.

[54] As reported by Norman Freeberg and Donald Payne, "Parental Influence on Cognitive Development in Early Childhood: A Review," Child Development, XXXVIII (1967), p. 79.

[55] Robert D. Hess and Virginia Shipman, "Early Experience and the Socialization of Cognitive Modes in Children," Child Development, XXXVI (1965), pp. 869-85.

[56] David P. Weikart and Delores Z. Lambie, "Preschool Intervention Through a Home Teaching Project," (paper presented at the 1968 Annual Meeting, American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Ill.).

[57] V. Crandall, et al., "Parents' Attitudes and Behaviors and Grade-School Children's Academic Achievement," Journal of Genetic Psychology, CIV (1964), pp. 53-66.

[58] J. Aronfreed, "The Nature, Variety, and Social Patterning of Moral Responses to Aggression," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LXIII (1961), pp. 223-40.

[59] G. Watson, "Some Personality Differences in Children Related to Strict or Permissive Parental Discipline," Journal of Psychology, XLN (1957), pp. 227-49.

[60] L. W. Hoffman, S. Rosen, and R. Lippitt, "Parental Coerciveness, Child Autonomy, and the Child's Role at School," Sociometry, XXIII (1960), pp. 15-22.

[61] S. I. Spector, "Study of Firm and Permissive Home Discipline," Journal of Educational Sociology, XXXVI (1962), pp. 115-23.

[62] Wesley Becker, "Consequences of Parental Discipline," in Martin L. Hoffman and Lois W. Hoffman, Review of Child Development Research, Vol. I, (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964), pp. 164-208.

[63] See, e.g., A. B. Heilbron, S. N. Harrell, and Betty Jo Gillard, "Child-rearing Patterns and the Effects of Social Nonreaction Upon Achievement Motivation," Child Development, XXXVIII (1967), pp. 267-81.

[64] A. L. Baldwin, "Socialization and the Parent-Child Relationship," Child Development, XIX (1948), pp. 127-36.

[65] Ibid., p. 129.

[66] Ibid., p. 129.

[67] Ibid., p. 135.

[68] A. L. Baldwin, Joan Kalhorn, and Fay Breese, "Patterns of Parent Behavior," Psychological Monographs, LVIII, (1945), whole number 268.

[69] See, e.g., R. R. Sears, E. E. Maccoby, and H. Levin, Patterns of Child Rearing (Evanston, Ill.: Row; Patternson, 1957). p. 307.

Part II

Section 1 - Family Structure and Educability

[70] James H. S. Bossard and Eleanor Stoker Boll, *The Sociology of Child Development* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960), p. 40.

[71] J. Richard Udry," The Social Context of Marriage (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippencott Company, 1966), p. 17.

[72] Ibid., p. 18.

[73] All Statistics in this paragraph are from Ernest W. Burgess, Harvey J. Locke, and Mary Margaret Thomas, *The Family* (New York: American Book Company, 1963), pp. 343-45.

[74] Specifically, from Bossard and Boll, op. cit., Chapter 3 pp. 47-67. See also Bossard and Boll, *The Large Family System* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1956).

[75] Bossard and Boll, *The Sociology of Child Development*, p. 61.

[76] Bernard C. Rosen, "Family Structure and Achievement Motivation," *American Sociological Review*, XXVI (1961), pp. 574-85.

[77] Bernard C. Rosen, "Family Structure and Value Transmission," Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, X (1964), pp. 59-76.

[78] J. W. B. Douglas, *The Home and the School: A Study of Ability and Attainment in the Primary School* (London: MacGibbon and Kee, 1964), Chapter 12, pp. 91-100.

[79] J. P. Lees and A. H. Steward, "Family or Sibship Position and Scholastic Ability," *Sociological Review*, V (1957), pp. 85-106 and 173-190.

[80] R. Williams and M. L. Mattson, "The Effects of Social Groupings Upon the Language of Preschool Children," *Child Development*, XII (1942), pp. 233-245.

[81] John Nisbet, "Family Environment and Intelligence," in A. H. Halsey, Jean Floud, and C. Arnold Anderson (eds.), *Education, Economy, and Society* (Glencoe, Ill.: Fress Press, 1961), pp. 273-87.

[82] Ibid., p. 275.

[83] Glen H. Elder, Jr. and Charles E. Boweman, "Family Structure and Child-rearing Patterns: the Effect of Family Size and Sex Composition," American Sociological Review, XXVII (1963), pp. 891-905.

[84] Ibid., p. 892.

[85] Bernard C. Rosen, "Family Structure and Achievement Motivation."

[86] Bernard C. Rosen, "Family Structure and Value Transmission."

[87] Sarach M. Schoonover, "The Relationship of Intelligence and Achievement to Birth Order, Sex of Sibling, and Age Interval," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, L (1959), pp. 143-146.

[88] Orville G. Brim, Jr., "Family Structure and Sex Role Learning by Children," *Sociometry*, XXI (1958), pp. 1-16.

[89] A L. Koch, "The Relation of 'Primary Mental Abilities' in Five- and Six-year-olds to Sex of Child and Characteristics of His Siblings," *Child Development*, XXV (1954), pp. 209-23.

[90] Discussion drawn from Bossard and Boll, *The Sociology of Child Development*, pp. 99-107.

[91] E. E. Sampson, "Birth Order, Need Achievement, and Conformity," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, XXIV (1962), pp. 155-59.

[92] Bernard C. Rosen, "Family Structure and Achievement Motivation."

[93] William S. Corlissa "Relationships in Achievement by Sex and Number of Children in the Family," *Michigan Education Journal*, XLII (1964), pp. 28-29.

[94] Lees and Stewart, op. cit.

[95] Koch, op. cit.

[96] Schoonover, op. cit.

[97] Brim, op. cit.

[98] Ibid., p. 14

[99] Schoonover, op. cit, and Koch, op. cit.

[100] Bossard and Boll, *The Sociology of Child Development*, p. 426.

[101] Martin Deutsch and Bert Brown, "Social Influences in Negro-White Intelligence Differences," Journal of Social Issues, XX (1964), pp. 24-35.

[102] George R. Bach, "Father Fantasies and Father Typing in Father Separated Children," Child Development, XVII (1946), pp. 63-79, and Joan McCord, William McCord, and Emily Thorber, "Some Effects of Paternal Absence on Male Children," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XXIV (1962), pp. 361-69.

Section 2 - Influences of Social Class and Ethnicity on Educability

[103] See Ronald G. Corwin, A Sociology of Education, (New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1965), p. 174.

[104] For a more complete discussion of problems inherent in approaches such as Warner's, see Ruth Koinhauser, The Warner Approach to Social Stratification, in Reinhard Bendin and Seymour Martin Lipset (eds.), Class Status and Power: A Reader in Social Stratification (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1953), pp. 229-255.

[105] Harold E. Jones, "Environmental Influences on Mental Development," in Leonard Carmichael (ed.), Manual of Child Psychology (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1946), pp. 592-594.

[106] See, e.g., such studies as Kenneth Eells, et al., Intelligence and Cultural Differences (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951); B. W. Estes, "Influence of Socioeconomic Status on Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children, An Exploratory Study," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XVIII (1953), pp. 58-62; Martin Deutsch and Bert Brown, "Social Influences in Negro-White Intelligence Differences," Journal of Social Issues, XX (1964), pp. 24-35; E. A. Milner, "A Study of the Relationships Between Reading Readiness in Grade One School Children and Patterns of Parent-Child Interactions," Child Development, XXII (1951), pp. 95-112; M. J. Schulman and R. J. Harighurst, "Relations Between Ability and Social Status in a Mid-western Community on Size of Vocabulary," Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXVIII (1947), pp. 437-442.

[107] Fred Strodtbeck, "Family Interaction, Values and Achievement," in D. C. McClelland, et al (eds.), Talent and Society, (Princeton, N. J.: Van Nostrand, 1958), pp. 135-194.

[108] Deutsch and Brown op. cit.

[109] See Llewellyn Gross and Orville Gursslin, "Middle-class and Lower-class Beliefs and Values: A Heuristic Model," in Alvin W. Gouldner and Helen P. Gouldner, Modern Sociology (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1963), pp. 168-177, or W. Lloyd Warner, Marcia Meeken and Kenneth Eells, Social Class in America (New York: Harper and Row, Inc., 1960) Chapter 1, pp. 3-33.

[110] Genevieve Knuper, "Portrait of the Underdog," Public Opinion Quarterly, XI (1947), pp. 103-114.

[111] Bernard C. Rosen, "Race, Ethnicity, and the Achievement Syndrome," American Sociological Review, XXIV (1959), p. 53.

[112] Clyde Kluckhonn, "Values and Value-Orientations in the Theory of Action: An Exploration in Definition and Classification," in Talcott Parsons and E. A. Shils (eds.), Toward a General Theory of Action (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951), pp. 388-433.

[113] Bernard C. Rosen, "The Achievement Syndrome: A Psycho-Cultural Dimension of Social Stratification," American Sociological Review, XXI (1956), pp. 203-11.

[114] Rosen, "Race, Ethnicity, and the Achievement Syndrome."

[115] Ibid.

[116] Rosen, "The Achievement Syndrome: A Psycho-Cultural Dimension of Social Stratification."

[117] Rosen, "Race, Ethnicity, and the Achievement Syndrome."

[118] Strodtbeck, op. cit.

[119] Esther S. Battle and J. B. Rotter, "Children's Feelings of Personal Control as Related to Social Class and Ethnic Group," Journal of Personality, XXXI, (1963), pp. 482-90.

[120] Vaughn J. Crandall, et al., "Motivational and Ability Determinants of Young Children's Intellectual Achievement Behaviors." Child Development, XXXIII (1962), pp. 642-61.

[121] Rosen, "Race, Ethnicity, and the Achievement Syndrome."

[122] Richard Bloom, Martin Whiteman, and Martin Deutsch, "Race and Social Class as Separate Factors Related to Social Environment," American Journal of Sociology, LXX (1965), 471-76.

[123] Herbert Hyman, "The Value Systems of Different Classes: A Social-Psychological Contribution to the Analysis of Stratification," in Bendix and Lipset (eds.), op. cit., pp. 426-42; Robert R. Bell, "Lower Class Negro Mothers' Aspirations for Their Children," Social Forces, XLIII (1965), pp. 493-500; Celia Burns Stendler, "Social Class Differences in Parental Attitudes Toward School at Grade 1 Level," Child Development, XXII (1951), pp. 37-46.

[124] Hyman, op. cit.

[125] See Melvin L. Kohn, "Social Class and Parental Values," American Journal of Sociology, LXIV (1959), pp. 337-51, and Kohn, "Social Class and the Parent-Child Relationship," American Journal of Sociology, LXVIII (1963), pp. 471-80.

[126] Leonard I. Peallin and M. L. Kohn, "Social Class, Occupation and Parental Values: A Cross-National Study," American Sociological Review, XXX (1966), pp. 466-79.

[127] See Wesley Becker, "Consequences of Parental Discipline," in Martin L. Hoffman and Lois W. Hoffman, Review of Child Development Research, Vol. I (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964), pp. 169-208.

[128] Bernard Rosen, "Family Structure and Value Transmission," Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, X (1964), pp. 59-76.

[129] Melvin L. Kohn, "Social Class and the Exercise of Parental Authority," American Sociological Review, XXIV (1959), p. 361.

[130] Ibid., p. 357.

[131] Robert D. Hess and Virginia Shipman, "Early Experiences and the Socialization of Cognitive Modes in Children," Child Development, XXXVI (1965), pp. 869-85.

[132] For further information on this subject see Allison Davis and Robert J. Harighurst, "Social Class and Color Differences in Childrearing," American Sociological Review, XI (1946), pp. 698-710; Richard A. Littman, Robert C. A. Moor, and John Pierce Jones, "Social Class Differences in Child Rearing: A Third Community for Comparison with Chicago and Newton," American Sociological Review, XXII (1957), pp. 697-704; M. A. White, "Social Class, Child Rearing Practices and Child Behavior," American Sociological Review, XXII (1957), pp. 704-12; Zena Smith Bkew, "Exposure to Child-rearing Experts: A Structural Interpretation of Class-Color Differences," American Journal of Sociology, LXIX (1964), pp. 595-608.

[133] G. F. Edwards, "Marriage and Family Life Among Negroes," Journal of Negro Education, XXXII (1963), pp. 451-65.

[134] See Deutsch and Brown, op. cit.

[135] Hilda Orr Fortune, "A Study of the Power Position of Mothers in Contemporary Negro Family Life in New York City," (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1963), Chapters 1-3, pp. 1-47.

[136] E. Franklin Frazier, The Negro Family in the United States (Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1939); revised Dryden Press, 1948.

[137] See also Hortense Powermaker, After Freedom (New York: The Viking Press, 1939).

[138] E. Franklin Frazier, The Negro in the United States, (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1957), p. 333.

[139] Fortune, op. cit., Chapters 5-7, pp. 60-115.

[140] Karl King, "A Comparison of the Negro and White Family Power Structure in Low Income Families," Child and Family, VI (1967) pp. 65-74.

[141] Rosen, "Race, Ethnicity, and the Achievement Syndrome."

[142] David C. McClelland, "Some Social Consequences of Achievement Motivation," M. R. Jones (ed.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 1955 (Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1955), pp. 41-65.

[143] Ira J. Gordon and Arthur W. Combs, "The Learner: Self and Perception," Review of Educational Research, XXVIII (1958), pp. 433-44.

[144] W. W. Wattenberg and C. Clifford, "Relation of Self-Concepts to Beginning Achievement in Reading," Child Development, XXXV (1964), pp. 461-67.

[145] Dorothy C. S. Laird, "How Eleven-Year-Old Boys See Their Teachers," Progressive Education, XXXIII (1956), pp. 115-18.

[146] See, e.g., H. F. Butts, "Skin Color Perception and Self-Esteem," Journal of Negro Education, XXXII (1963), pp. 122-28, and Caliguri, "Self-Concept of the Poverty Child," Journal of Negro Education, XXXV (1966), pp. 280-82.

[147] Butts, op. cit.

[148] Pearline Yeatts, "An Analysis of Developmental Changes in the Self-Concept of Negro and White Children Grades 3 to 12," (paper presented at the 1968 Annual Meeting, American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Ill.). David Gottlieb, "Making People Square: The Response of Negro and White Youth," (paper presented at the 1968 Annual Meeting, American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Ill.).

[149] Stendler, op. cit.

[150] W. H. Sewell and A. O. Haller, "Factors in the Relationship Between Social Status and the Personality Adjustment of the Child," *American Sociological Review*, XXIV (1959), pp. 511-20.

Section 3 - Language Social Class and Educability

[151] John Nisbet, "Family Environment and Intelligence," in A. H. Halsey, Jean Floud, and C. Arnold Anderson, *Education, Economy, and Society* (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press of Glencoe, duc., 1961), p. 275.

[152] Ibid., p. 276.

[153] See discussion in S. B. Saranson and T. Gladwin, "Psychological and Cultural Problems in Mental Subnormality: A Review of Research," *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, LVII (1958), pp. 108-118.

[154] E. A. Milner, "A Study of the Relationships between Reading Readiness in Grade One School Children and Patterns of Parent-Child Interactions," *Child Development*, 22 (1951), p. 99.

[155] M. J. Schulman and R. J. Harighurst, "Relations between Ability and Social Status in a Mid-western Community IV: Size of Vocabulary," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 35 (1947), p. 440.

[156] Nisbet, op. cit, p. 275.

[157] Milner, op. cit.

[158] E. Bing, "Effect of Childrearing Practices on Development of Differential Cognitive Abilities," *Child Development*, XXXIV (1963), pp. 631 *et passim*.

[159] Nisbet, op. cit., pp. 273 *et passim*.

[160] R. M. Wolf, "The Identification and Measurement of Environment Process Variables Related to Intelligence," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1964), cited by Freeberg and Payne, op. cit., p. 71.

[161] Georgianne Baker, "Patterning of Home Resources for Children's Early Cognitive Growth," (Unpublished paper, Michigan State University, 1965), pp. 26-30.

[162] Norma Radin and Constance K. Kamii, "The Child-rearing Attitudes of Disadvantaged Negro Mothers and Some Educational Implications," *Journal of Negro Education*, XXXIV (1965), pp. 138, *et passim*.

[163] Milner, op. cit., p. 109.

[164] The following discussion, unless otherwise noted, is taken from: Basil Bernstein, "Social Class and Linguistic Development: A Theory of Social Learning," in Halsey, Floud, and Anderson, op. cit., pp. 288-314 and B. Bernstein, "Some Sociological Determinants of Perception," *British Journal of Sociology*, IX (1958), pp. 159-174.

[165] Bernstein, "Social Class and Linguistic Development," p. 291.

[166] Ibid., pp. 297-298.

[167] M. Deutsch, "The Role of Social Class in Language Development and Cognition," *American Journal of Orthospsychiatry*, XXV (1965), p. 86.

[168] Ibid., pp. 78-88

[169] Ibid., p. 85.

[170] Ibid., p. 86.

[171] Leonard Schatzman and Anslem Strauss, "Social Class and Modes of Communication," *American Journal of Sociology*, LX (1955), pp. 329-38.

[172] Ibid., p. 333.

[173] Robert Hess, op. cit., and Robert D. Hess and Virginia Shipman, "Early Experience and the Socialization of Cognitive Modes in Children," *Child Development*, XXXVI (1965), pp. 869-85.

[174] Robert Hess, "Educability and Rehabilitation: The Future of the Welfare Class," (Paper read at the Thirtieth Groves Conference on Marriage and the Family, Knoxville, Tennessee, 1964), pp. 8-9.

[175] Ibid., p. 19.

[176] Ibid., p. 20.

[177] Ibid., p. 9.

[178] Bernstein, "Social Class and Linguistic Development," p. 203.

[179] Ibid., p. 207.

[180] Material in this paragraph is taken from Hess, "Educability and Rehabilitation," p. 9-10.

[181] Ibid., p. 10.

[182] Hess, "Early Experience and the Socialization of Cognitive Modes in Children," pp. 870-871.

[183] Bernstein, "Social Class and Linguistic Development," p. 296.

[184] Hess, "Educability and Rehabilitation," p. 15.

[185] Ibid., p. 16.

Part III

Section 1 - Learning and the Mass Media

[186] Elihu Katza and Paul K. Lazarsfeld, Personal Influence (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1955).

[187] Wilbur Schramm, Jack Lyle, and Edwin B. Parker, Television in the Lives of Our Children (Palo Alto, California: Stanford University Press, 1961), p. 24.

[188] Ibid., p. 30.
Findings here are quite consistent. See also Eleanor E. Maccoby, "Television: Its Impact on School Children," Public Opinion Quarterly, XV (1951), pp. 421-44, and Paul A. Witty, "School Children and Television. Summary of the Result: Of Ten Yearly Studies of Children's Television Viewing in the Chicago Methropolitan Area." (Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Chicago, 1959).

[189] Schramm, *et al*., op. cit., p. 36.

[190] Ibid., p. 79.

[191] Ibid., p. 80.

[192] Ibid., p. 105.

[193] Ibid., pp. 98-117.

[194] Hilde Himmelweit, A. A. Oppenheim and P. Vince, *Television and the Child: An Empirical Study of the Effect of Television on the Young* (London: Oxford University Press, 1958).

[195] Wilmer S. Rush, "Some Factors Influencing Children's Use of the Mass Media of Communication," *Journal of Experimental Education*, XXXIII (1965), pp. 300-303.

[196] John W. Riley, Jr., and Matilda White Riley, "Mass Communication and the Social System," in Robert K. Merton, Leonard Broom and Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., (eds.) *Sociology Today* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1965), p. 549.

[197] Ibid., p. 550.

[198] Matilda White Riley and John W. Riley, Jr., "A Sociological Approach to Communication Research," *Public Opinion Quarterly,* XV (1951), pp. 444-60.

[199] Riley and Riley, "Mass Communication and the Social System," pp. 550-51.

[200] Eleanor E. Maccoby, "Why Do Children Watch Television?" *Public Opinion Quarterly*, XVIII (1954), pp. 239-44.

[201] Schramm, op. cit., pp. 117-34.

[202] See E. P. Duggan, "Children at the Television Set," *Times Educational Supplement*, November 11, 1955 and Jack Greenstein, "Effects of Television Upon Elementary School Grades," *Journal of Education Research*, XLVIII (1954), pp. 161-76.

[203] Schramm, op. cit., p. 77

[204] A. J. Brodbeck, "The Mass-Media as a Socializing Agency," (Paper presented to the American Psychological Association Symposium on Children and the Mass-Media, San Francisco, 1955).

[205] Schramm, op. cit., pp. 85-88 and C. C. Evans, "Television for The Preschool Child," *Elementary English*, XXXII, (1955), pp. 541-42.

[206] Schramm, op. cit., pp. 88-89.

[207] Ibid., p. 153.

[208] Maccoby, "Television: It's Impact on School Children," pp. 421-44.

[209] Albert Bandura, "What TV Violence Can Do To Your Child," Look, XXVII (1963), pp. 46-48 and 52, Leonard Berkowitz, "The Effects of Observing Violence," Scientific American, CCX (1964), and Eleanor E. Maccoby, H. Levin, and B. M. Selya, "The Effect of Emotional Arousal on the Retention of Aggressive and Non-Aggressive Movie Content," American Psychologist, X (1955), p. 359.

[210] W. M. Gerson, "Mass Media Socialization Behavior: Negro-White Differences," Social Forces, XLV (1966), pp. 40-50.

Section 2 - Peer Groups and the School Environment

[211] James H. S. Bossard and Eleanor Stoker Boll, The Sociology of Child Development (New York: Harper Brothers, 1960), pp. 498-517.

[212] Ibid., pp. 524-530.

[213] E.g., James S. Coleman, The Adolescent Society (New York: Free Press, 1961), and C. Wayne Gordon, The Social System of the High School (New York: Free Press, 1957).

[214] Bossard and Boll, op. cit., p. 516.

[215] Celia Burns Stendler and Norman Young, "The Impact of Beginning First Grade Upon Socialization as Reported by Mothers," Child Development XXI (1950), pp. 241-60.

[216] Wilbur B. Brookover and David Gottlieb, A Sociology of Education (New York: American Book Company, 1964), p. 269.

[217] Burton R. Clark, Educating the Expert Society (San Francisco: Chandler, 1962).

[218] Brookover, op. cit., p. 396.

[219] Pope, "Scoioeconomic Contrasts in Children's Peer Culture Prestige Values," Genetic Psychological Monographs, XLVIII (1953), pp. 157-220.

[220] Joseph Featherstone, The Primary School Revolution, Reprint available from The New Republic, 1967.